THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

VOL. XXIX, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1922

The Creation of the Woman from the Man
S. CHR. BRÖNNICHE 385

The Type of School Needed for New-Church Education
LEWIS F. HITE 397

Swedenborg and the Sexuality of Plants (a Symposium)
I. F. A. GARDINER
II. G. E. HOLMAN III. ANDREW EADIE 420

Vowel Significance
J. T. HALLEBORG 430

The New-Churchman's Attitude Toward Evolution
HAROLD S. CONANT 447

The March of Bible Criticism [a review of J. P. Peters' "Bible and Spade"]
JACOB EMANUEL WERREN 456

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

Reflections on the Great Strikes of 1922 JOHN DABOLL - - 473
Swedenborg and the Sexuality of Plants LEWIS F. HITE - - 477

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

The Testimony of Three Seers JOHN DABOLL - - - - 487
The Christian Sabbath GEORGE HENRY DOLE - - - - 493

Current Literature :

Abraham Kanovitch's "The Will to Beauty" LEWIS F. HITE - 497
Kirsopp Lake's "Immortality and the Modern Mind"
EDWARD AUSTIN WARREN, JR. - - - - - - - 501
Charles H. Pridgeon's "Is Hell Eternal" WM. F. WUNSCH - - 503
Frederic C. Howe's "Denmark, a Co-operative Commonwealth"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 508
S. and B. Webb's "The Consumer's Co-operative Movement"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 505
Sherman and Kent's "The Children's Bible"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 510
Louis Pendleton's "The Wedding Garment"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 512

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, and of Mr. B. A. Whittemore and Rev. John Daboll; with the Rev. Messrs. H. Clinton Hay and William F. Wunsch, and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton, in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter. (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXIX.] OCTOBER, 1922 [No. 4

THE CREATION OF THE WOMAN FROM THE MAN

By the REV. S. CHR. BRÖNNICHE
(of Copenhagen, Denmark)

ACCORDING to the New Church, the first eleven chapters of Genesis are pure allegory, consequently nothing there is of historical nature; just as in the parables of the New Testament. In the first three chapters, we have an account of the men belonging to the Most Ancient Church, called "Adam," or man. From the beginning to the end of this Church, and where the appearing of the woman is treated of, the tendency towards what belongs to one's own (*proprium*) is described. Previously the highly developed generations to which the men of the Most Ancient Church belonged, who were of a celestial genius, lived alone with God, satisfied to be led immediately from the Lord. However, the time came when this was no more enough for them, and they preferred to be led by external influences, by what was from appearance and from the natural surroundings of the world. This circumstance found expression in the words of Jehovah God: "It is not good that the man should be alone." By "a help as with him" is signified that which became the *ownhood* of the man of this Church, and which later on is called one of the ribs of man, by means of which the woman was built.

This is the explanation given in the teachings of our Church. Now, what conclusion may be drawn from it, or what kind of enlightenment does this explanation give, in regard to the creation of the woman from the man?

First of all, we may infer that a mere literal consideration of the account tells us nothing in regard to the creation of the woman in the natural sense for it is internal and spiritual or heavenly things that are treated of. He who is, nevertheless, inclined to dwell upon the letter of the description in order to solve the question as to *when* the woman was created, only needs to look at the words in the preceding chapter, where we read: "God created man in His own image, . . . male and female created He them." These words will, perhaps then, more than indicate the natural fact that the woman was created *at the same time* as the man, not after him. If the woman had not been created immediately by the Lord as well as the man but mediately, or through him, she could not but be subordinate to him in like manner as the animal is subordinate to man,—a thought to which we cannot give our consent, however flattering it may appear to the vanity of the man; but no doubt the idea of the subordinate positions of the woman to the man, especially among oriental people, has some connection with a merely natural comprehension of the Biblical presentation.

In Chapter v: 1, 2, it is said:

> In the day that God created Man, He made him into the likeness of God. Male and female created He them, and He blessed them and called their name Man, in the day when they were created.

This, moreover, taken literally, suggests that to God neither man (vir) alone nor woman alone is man (homo), but that taken together or in unity they make one human being or man. This is also to be understood by the words about their being "one flesh" through their marriage; for "flesh" means man (homo) here, as well as in many other places in the sacred Scriptures.

As we look away from the idea of a natural creation of

the woman from the man we prepare the way for a spiritual understanding; and according to that we shall become able to see that the presentation in Genesis can not only be applied to the whole line of development that took place within the generations that were first regenerated by the Lord, and that belonged to the Church called "Adam," but that it also concerns a certain process which goes on in the female mind during a truly conjugial companionship.

In order that the things indicated concerning the meaning of the words to "live alone," or about the "help" which should be "as with" the man, and about the "woman" into which the rib was built, may stand clear to our comprehension, we do well to consider what has been said of these points in the work, "Arcana Cœlestia" and then to turn to the work, "Conjugial Love."

In the first work mentioned, it is said about the posterities of the Most Ancient Church which is here treated, that they did not want to live alone; that is to say, they did not want to remain "celestial men." The words: "It is not good that the man should be alone," have been spoken from the point of view of fallen man, though the fall here treated of is only a fall from a higher form of heavenly life to a lower one.

But the Lord follows man when he departs from Him from the very beginning. In this case, it is done by granting man what he wishes, not satisfied to use as it was given the faculty with which he has been endowed by the Lord, to look into himself and know the quality of the different spiritual affections of the mind that are signified by "the beasts of the field" and "the fowls of the heavens." Jehovah God had formed them out of the ground and brought them to the man to see what he would call each of them, as it is expressed; but they were not regarded to be any help "as with him." Man wanted to find the help with himself; he wanted to perceive his life as his own; since it appeared to him that the affections and thoughts moving within him belonged to him as if originating in him, at the

same time as the perception that these only flowed into him. So the soul from the Lord began to enter into the shade, while before it had been the central element in their consciousness. This removal from the real truth and accession to the apparent one is expressed in the words: "And Jehovah God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and he slept." In this deep sleep, the significance of the "rib" appears.

The rib is a bone of the chest. In the chest the heart has its place; and the heart is the symbol of that which makes the life of the whole man—his ruling love. We may then say that the chest signifies the life of love with a man, whether this tends towards evil or good. But the rib belongs to the chest, though it has no life. It also serves the use of upholding the chest and of supporting the life that pulsates within. The rib is thus something external, something instrumental and subordinate; it is, indeed, dead in itself, and for this reason it signifies man's own, his sense of being something in himself, or that which Swedenborg calls his "*proprium*." But we must consider this point more thoroughly in order to understand it fully.

The Hebrew word for "rib" is derived from a root that means to lean or incline, to bend (on one side). The rib is, indeed, bent not outward but inward towards man himself. Thus it pictures the tendency of man in his external and lower nature to embrace himself and all that he regards as his own, preferring that above anything else. As long as man is foreign to the thought of possessing something from himself, the signification of the rib and all that it comprises can only be something good; it then protects and supports the life of the Lord in man. But when man aims at a self (*proprium*) that is influenced by the apparent truth, instead of being guided by the real truth—the truth that all life, the heavenly and spiritual as well as the natural, is derived from and thus also belongs to the Lord alone—then his tendency to encompass himself and the life that is within him becomes evil. He bends away from the way of the Lord and

seeks what is his own, in the same degree that he essentially looks to the created, finite, and frail being that he himself is, and to the impressions that come to him when he judges from the external and natural "Ego." Man then seeks a help "as with him" instead of seeking it with the Lord. Not only here in Genesis a bone signifies that which belongs to man or his ownhood, which he is so inclined to "seek first," or to regard as most essential, but many other places in Scripture point in the same direction, as when "dead bones" or "flesh and bones" are mentioned; but enough has been said about this.

In the account of how the woman was created, it is first said that Jehovah, God, builded the rib taken from the man (homo) into a woman; later the man (homo) said that she was taken out of the man (vir), for then man (homo) is awakened from his deep sleep and the woman or the wife has been led to him. Let us see what we can learn by this.

That Jehovah "built" the rib taken from the man into a woman denotes spiritually speaking that he raised up that which was "fallen" in the man and gave it a unified soul. "He gave him the perception of the truth" that though it appears as if he lives, consequently also thinks and acts from himself, and therefore is not responsible to any other, still in reality he lives only from the Lord and is responsible to Him for everything he does. And if man lives his life in harmony with the Divine, then also everything which he appears to do for his own sake is good. The rib, dead, hard, and bent towards man himself, is taken out of him and Jehovah God closes up the flesh in the place thereof. But this is not enough. An entirely new life originates in man as he is penetrated by love from the Lord; he perceives a hitherto unknown desire to encompass and appropriate to himself wisdom or truth from Him; and the woman or the wife (ishah from ish, man) is led to the man (vir). Here we speak of man (vir); for as the woman is a form of love and therefore expresses the will-principle or the element of

affection; so the man (vir) is a form of wisdom, representing intelligence or the principle of acknowledgment.

In man (homo) the love from the Lord which the woman here represents must be led to and received by the man (vir), which represents the wisdom; and when this has taken place, the spiritual marriage, from which the true marriage between an individual man and woman must descend, arises. As long as the man in man (homo) is inclined to be led by the appearance, he can only think that the woman is formed by himself or that love from the Lord is derived from man himself; but when man (homo) is awakened from his dream, when that which is his own (*proprium*) has been vivified, then he will see that in reality she is formed (or built) from the man (vir) as love from the Lord develops in man on the basis of the wisdom, the acknowledgment or conception of truth, which he has from the Lord; and then the man (homo) says, "This now is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh."

Now let us approach the subject according to the presentation in the work "Conjugial Love."

In this work, n. 193, we read that "the woman is actually formed into a wife, according to the description in the Book of Creation." Here it is further said:

> A rib of the breast, in the Word, signifies, in the spiritual sense, natural truth (*verum naturale*); . . . the man's breast signifies that essential and peculiar principle which is distinguished from the breast of the woman: that this is wisdom may be seen above, n. 187; for truth supports wisdom as the ribs do the breast. These things are signified, because the breast is that part of man in which all his principles are as in their centre. From these considerations it is evident, that the woman was created out of the man by a transfer of his peculiar wisdom, which is the same thing as to be created out of natural truth; and that the love thereof was transferred from the man into the woman to the end that conjugial love might exist; and that that was done in order that the love of the wife and not self-love might be in the man: for the wife, in consequence of her innate disposition cannot do otherwise than convert self-love, as existing with the man, into his love to herself; and I have been informed that this is effected by virtue of the wife's love itself, neither the man nor the wife

being conscious of it: hence, no man can possibly love his wife with true conjugial love, who from a principle of self-love is vain and conceited of his own intelligence. When this arcanum relating to the creation of the woman from the man is understood, it may be seen that the woman in like manner is as it were created or formed from the man in marriage; and that this is effected by the wife, or rather through her by the Lord, who imparts inclination to women whereby they produce such an effect: for the wife receives into herself the image of the man and thereby appropriates to herself his affection . . . and conjoins the man's internal will with her own, . . . and also claims to herself the propagated forms of his soul. . . From these considerations it is evident, that according to the description in the book of Genesis interiorly understood, a woman is formed into a wife by such things as she takes out of the husband and his breast and implants in herself.

From what has here been adduced we may see that according to the doctrine of our Church the story of the creation of the woman, or of her formation from the man, has not only regard to what took place in time long ago when the Lord gave the men of the Most Ancient Church a vivified self (ownhood), but also concerns the relation between every man or woman, who in marriage aims at love truly conjugial. In the marriage in which the parties have only an external and natural end in view, we cannot expect a new creation like that which is signified by the formation of the woman, or the wife, from the man's rib. In our time most marriages are mainly natural, however much attraction the partners, in the beginning especially, may find towards each other. Even in those marriages where both the parties have religion, and thus look inward and upward towards spiritual or eternal life, the marriage-relation is in the beginning of a relatively external character; it is not yet spiritual and still less celestial, as it is with the angels; it has even something not quite pure clinging to it. But this cannot be otherwise, as everyone may easily see, considering the fact that most marriages are contracted in younger years, or in a state in which neither the man nor the woman has reached spiritual maturity, which alone the process of regeneration can impart. But in spite of this

circumstance, marriage is—if it rests on spiritual ground or has the support of true religion—the very best means of the higher development of man's character. A true marriage gives a man more than anything else the *opportunity* to progress along the way the Lord wants him to go; it helps man to emancipate himself from the dominion of self and the world through the putting off of the old Adam and the putting on of the new one. Whether marriage is to lead to such a result with any man or woman depends on himself or herself, even if in the spiritual world, or after death, it should become apparent that the partners here on earth did not belong to each other in heaven.

This is one reason why marriage in this world, the deepest fountain of which is of Divine nature, ought to be honored and regarded holy in its principle, unless it becomes violated so as to lose its representation.

It is evident that when we speak of the creation of the woman, or the wife, from the man, or husband, no other wife can be meant than that which in spirit and truth belongs to him, as there can only be taken *one* wife out of a certain husband. Moreover, in the Book of Creation it is said that it was Jehovah God who took her and led her to the man; the wife, which the Lord gives is and can only be the right one. But no man can receive the right wife, the wife that belongs to him in eternity, unless he be lifted up on a higher plane of life than the natural one into which he first enters.

As before indicated, the man is a form of understanding, and the woman a form of the will; or what is the same thing, he has his strength in the faculty of thought, while the power of the woman is in the affection; his function is as the lungs, hers, as the heart; he makes his way especially by means of reasoning, she uses her immediate perception or intuition, letting the affection tell her what to do. For this reason, the two are able to supplement each other in the most perfect way. By working together, they may attain what they can never gain, if each works for himself

or herself; therefore they ought to seek to help each other, especially in a real marriage.

In many cases a man may, indeed, exhibit a stronger will-power and possess a stronger affection than a woman; so a woman may manifest a greater understanding than a man; but in spite of this we may truly say that the voluntary principle and all that belongs to it is characteristic of the woman, as the intellectual principle is characteristic of the man. We must on this point be careful not to look superficially at the matter. We do not here speak of any superiority of the man to the woman, or of the woman to the man. On the mere natural plane, man and woman do not always manifest such differences, but on the more *interior,* or higher planes of the mind, this essential difference expresses itself.

In the work on "Conjugial Love," n. 188, we read: "With man there is an elevation of the mind into a higher light," while "with woman there is an elevation of mind into a higher heat as the woman feels the delight of her heat in the man's light." In the same number it is said that the light and the heat mentioned is the light and the heat which "the angels of the higher heaven possess," and that the elevation with the woman into a higher heat is an elevation into a more chaste and pure conjugial love, and that continually towards the conjugial element, which from creation is concealed in her inmost (mind). This elevation is in itself an opening of the mind; for the human mind is divided into regions as the world is divided into atmospheres.

This instruction is of great importance to a real understanding of the words about the creation of the woman, or the wife, from the man in a true marriage. The "natural truth," which the rib of the man is said to signify, has not become vivified as long as regeneration has not taken place. His whole comprehension of life, the spiritual as well as the natural life, is then also external, earth-bound and dead.

But natural truth, intelligence, and wisdom, may serve

as support of spiritual and heavenly life, just as the rib may support the breast. During regeneration, the conciousness of man, his understanding and his will, is elevated into a higher plane of life, and, by means of this, his natural conceptions also become spiritual or heavenly in essence. But that the will may be elevated, or made spiritual, the understanding must yield its help. The "naturally true" element, or *entire external view* of the man, is taken out of him without his perceiving anything of this, in the same degree as he learns to appropriate the truth apart from himself as a centre. He has to learn to love truth for its own sake, or on account of the good to which it leads; he must practice it from unselfish motives.

In loving the peculiar conception of truth which is with her husband, the wife appropriates it to herself in her way, not intellectually or as a theory as the man does, but practically in life. She thus "converts self-love as existing with the man, into his love of herself," or into that which makes her a woman, and in this way she is created or rather built into a wife from the man in her marriage. It is the Lord who insinuates into the woman this tendency to transform and vivify this in the beginning and in itself dead element in the man, which makes him a hard and cold theorist. The woman, moreover, receives her love, especially the conjugial love, directly from the Lord, but the man receives his love indirectly through her, however incredible this may appear to him. Consequently it is the woman who, according to the revelation given to the New Church, stands with the goblet in her hand and from it she fills the cup of the man in the same degree as he is able and willing to receive. This circumstance, however, does not work against the fact that the woman is created from the man. She is not formed from his love, feeling or affection, or from that which the will-principle really comprises, for his love is directed towards what is his own before the woman or the wife appears. Still less is she formed from his conjugial love, as this does not exist with him except from the woman; but

she is formed from that which is just as necessary to the woman as love is to the man, that is to say from the intelligence of the man or from his insight or wisdom; she is formed from the particular view of life which he possesses, because of this power to penetrate into the essence of things and to see them in connection. This power with the man a woman must be able to lean upon if he shall truly become a husband to her. In the same degree as he possesses this, in the same degree she gets occasion to apply her love, the love that enables her to lead him away from his originally hard and cold natural comprehension of truth, and to vivify it.

Now, let us ask, is this presentation of the relations between man and woman in marriage something that indicates that they are not equal? Is the woman less than the man because in this way she is taken out of, or formed from, him? If so, the man is also less than the woman because he receives his love of her from her, or from the Lord *through* her. Still it is an essential part of the subject. The most important thing is that each party gives and receives from the other, each giving of what has been given by the Lord.

The account of the creation of the woman from the man not only shows *what* that is which a woman ought to seek for with a man to be truly a wife to him; it also shows what it is a man must have to become truly a husband, viz., the thought of his own excellence in regard to his comprehension of truth, for this thought is connected with self-love. This is also represented in the words about his leaving father and mother to cleave to his wife. The husband is to look to her and to no one else as the one who is able in the very best way to help him to practice in life the truth he acknowledges. In this way his acknowledgment of the truth is lifted to a higher plane and becomes spiritual, or heavenly. Inasmuch as the woman in this way helps the man to embody in life the truth which he possesses and which she loves; her love is also elevated by it into a

corresponding plane, to the spiritual or heavenly life; she is created, arises or manifests herself to his conciousness, as his wife indeed, his vivified self, the ideal of which he has been dreaming in his natural and sleeping state. As the man in Eden he may then say: "Now, it is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh."

S. Chr. Brönniche.

THE TYPE OF SCHOOL NEEDED FOR NEW-CHURCH EDUCATION

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite

THE subject of New-Church education and the type of school needed for such education is peculiarly appropriate to this occasion. The locality is identified with the subject; the atmosphere is loaded with the sentiments, the aspirations, and the ideals, of generations of teachers and students who have come here in pursuit of New-Church higher education. The Convention, assembled here for the first time in its history, has fittingly made the subject of education the keynote of its interest and attention, thus emphasizing the vital, ever-present, ever-growing importance of education for life.

We all believe in New-Church education just as we all believe in New-Church life. We all know by experience what New-Church life is and what New-Church education is, for we have this experience in greater or less degree by the very fact of living in the Church and its atmosphere; and the two, education and life, are *inseparable*. The very fact of living involves education, adaptation to the varied and ever changing forces of the environment. Without education, without constant adaptation and re-adaptation, living would be stagnant and monotonous; in fact, no living organism could persist without some measure of education, some progress in adaptation. Education, therefore, is not a mere haphazard nor an artificial accompaniment of life, a thing that may be chosen or neglected it will; it is an original, essential, universal factor in the processes of life and in the accomplishment of the purposes of life.

But, however natural and inevitable education may be,

it is obviously and significantly varied in kind and degree. This is involved in the immense complexity of life; the endless details and changes in the environment, and the incalculable differences of men. Thus arise those familiar and troublesome differences both in education itself and in our views and conceptions of education; for these differences are due to the emphasis placed upon this or that feature of the environment, and this or that character of the person. Such complexity makes it both convenient and necessary to distinguish and classify the features of the environment, the differences of men, and the types of education.

One broad distinction of constant and too much neglected importance is that between *natural* education, the education acquired by the mere fact of living in the environment and re-acting upon it, and education directed to specific ends by appropriate methods and institutions. Ever since the days of Plato and the classical debate between Socrates and Protagoras, this natural education and higher, or systematically directed, education have held the field in more or less opposition and in more or less co-operation. The issue between Socrates and Protagoras was, of course, whether or not virtue can be taught. Protagoras, and the other Sophists, professed to teach virtue; Socrates had doubts as to both the results and the method of their teaching, and he pressed Protagoras with searching questions which turned on the point that virtue implies knowledge, and yet knowledge does not always secure virtue. When Socrates pressed the argument that if virtue could be taught, wise men would teach their sons to be the most virtuous members of the community; Pericles, for example, would have taken the greatest pains to have his sons taught virtue, whereas, in fact, he let them run wild. At this point, Protagoras accepted Socrates' distinction between teaching virtue in general and teaching proficiency in the special arts, and urged that in community virtues, political virtue, for example, these wise men relied on the natural education acquired by mere living in the community. The perplexities of the discussion soon led to the

fundamental question of what is virtue and what is its relation to knowledge. And here Socrates pointed the way to the conclusion, which was his final word on the subject, that virtue is knowledge. To put this conclusion obviously and validly, we should understand that virtue and knowledge coincide when the knowledge is complete. In other words, if a man knew all the consequences of alternative acts he would always choose the act having only good consequences, the only proper behavior of a free and rational being. This is practically our position today; it is the principle upon which our public school system is based, namely, that good citizenship is the product of education, and that good citizenship and education go together. We agree, then, with the wisest of the Greeks that education is inseparable from life, especially community life; and we also agree that natural education is insufficient for complete living, or for special advanced types of living.

The distinction between natural education and systematically directed education points to two mutually co-operating fields of educational effort and duty. In the first place, we are bound to provide a *constantly improving environment* so that natural education may be as complete as possible. The progress of civilization has no doubt accomplished this in a measure. The Church, social and industrial organization, the multiplication and distribution of books and periodicals, the products of Art; all these features of the environment influence more or less directly and indirectly every member of the community, and thus accomplish the purpose of promoting natural education. But here, too, a close survey of history brings us face to face with the disturbing and obstinate fact that these institutions are abused as well as used; and this fact is of such far reaching importance as to raise the question whether on the whole there is any such thing as *progress*. When we come in close contact with some of the flowering periods of antiquity, for example, with the social refinement and intellectual cultivation so vividly presented in Plato's Dialogues, to say nothing

of Greek drama and architecture, it is hard to point to progress or even parallels in subsequent ages. In any case, a little reflection of this kind is enough to warn us against falling easy victims to the disease of modernism. For in spite of the achievements of modern life, we have only to open our eyes to see that the existing institutions of civilization, even Christianity itself, as well as our social and industrial organizations are tottering. It is not enough to say "The Lord reigns in heaven." The Lord has been reigning in heaven throughout history, but that fact did not prevent the disasters of history, nor the destruction of civilizations. It is not enough to say that "The Lord is now fulfilling the prediction of His Second Coming." The Lord cannot come to those who refuse to receive him, but set up man-made idols in His stead. Men have to be willing to receive the Lord in His Second Coming, they have to learn to know Him in His Second Coming, man's spirit has to be elevated and enlightened before they may hope to receive the Lord in His Second Coming. It is true that He comes in the clouds, not, however, in the dark clouds of man-made obscurities, but in the bright clouds of His own Word, the true thoughts of men formed in the light of His Word. No doubt the Lord is providing all possible means for man's use in lifting his mind and heart to states in which He can be received; opportunities for knowing and doing the Lord's will on earth as it is done in heaven are increasing immensely, but co-extensive opportunities for abuse are also at hand. We cannot depend upon the influence of the natural unregulated environment alone for the education we need; we are likely to become victims rather than masters of the environment so operating. We cannot forget without disaster that our present environment is to an incalculable extent the product of past vices. We have with us the inveterate and all pervading poison of commercialized, socialized, and so-called personal vices, which infects unrecognizably the spiritual atmosphere in which we live and breathe. The natural education of the environment, then, is neither safe nor suf-

ficient. It is necessary and supremely important to put the individual in the position to react upon the environment freely and intelligently. This brings us to the consideration of systematically directed and developed education.

The education directed by specific purpose to selected ends is a more advanced and complete type than natural education; it is accomplished by the deliberate use of selected means. In the course of human development, men have selected and emphasized certain interests, certain types of endowment, certain objects and modes of life; as a consequence, we have Greek thought, Greek literature, and Greek art; we have Roman government and Roman law; we have mediæval learning and mediæval schools; and we have the whole body of modern educational institutions, especially the school system from the kindergarten and primary classes to the great universities. All these are specific educational institutions; art museums, libraries, the many forms of dramatic representation, lecture bureaus, co-operative organizations, the crafts, are constantly operating features of the educational environment, but they need to be supplemented by the highly specialized and highly organized educational agencies which have so immensely developed in our school system. The school, if you please, is that feature of the environment which has been created and is designed, not merely to train men for suitable vocations, but to develop the individual to the most advanced exercise of freedom and rationality, in other words to make *men* rather than or in addition to *instruments*.

A glance at the history of schools reveals to some extent the ideals which it has ever been the purpose and function of schools to pursue, and as far as practicable to realize. The Greek pedagogue, the Roman school-master, the early mediæval cloister schools, and the later mediæval universities, the highly developed school system of modern times, all point to stages of development of educational ideals and of educational institutions. Xenophon's Cyropedia, Plato's Dialogues, the works of Cicero, Quintilian, and Longinus,

the works of the mediæval doctors and afterwards those of the educational reformers, the numerous recent books on educational history, theory, and practice, set before us the educational ideals of the ages and of advancing civilization.

The educational ideals and practice of any period is most definitely expressed and embodied in the curriculum. Therefore, the curriculum is the center of educational interest and the gage of educational performance. Greek education was carried on mainly by private tutors, or in private schools and the Romans followed the Greeks in this. Though for the more advanced age, the palæstra and the gymnasia were public schools, and so were the music schools. Even the Greek schools for higher education, like the Academy and the Lyceum, were conducted by one man in the form of conversations and lectures. As the attendance grew and the teaching became more highly organized, assistants were employed; the head of the school was called Scholarch. Theophrastus, the successor of Aristotle as head of the Lyceum, had an attendance of 10,000 students. On the Athenian models, schools were established and flourished in the large cities throughout the civilized peoples of the Mediterranean Basin. The tradition of these schools was handed down to the middle ages, and formed the organizing principle of the mediæval curriculum. Reading, writing, arithmetic, music, and gymnastics were the staple features of the education of every Greek and Roman boy. These, with the exception of gymnastics, were adopted by the Church schools and under the guidance of Plato's educational scheme were developed into the famous *Trivium* and *Quadrivium,* the curriculum which has continued down to the present day, and is now the basis of all liberal education. It comprised Grammar, Rhetoric, and Dialectic (the *Trivium*); and Arithmetic, Geometry, Astronomy, and Music (the *Quadrivium*). These are the "Seven Liberal Arts" which form the basis of our present college degrees of A. B. and A. M. It is obvious that with easy and natural extension this curriculum expands into the study of languages

and literatures, as well as the arts of composition and public speaking; dialectic as the tool of the finished debater develops into logic, psychology, and metaphysics. While of the *Quadrivium,* the arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy expand into mathematics, physics, and chemistry; and the combination of psychology, physics, and chemistry directs us to the biological sciences. The study of music leads to the fine arts. The study of literatures and the equipment of the finished debater takes us into the field of history. With a little regrouping, then, we get *the seven liberal arts* of our modern curriculum, namely, the languages, history, mathematics, physics, biology, philosophy, and the fine arts. These studies may be called the seven liberal arts because they lead to the complete equipment of the educated man of our day. The study of languages leads to the use of language in reading, writing, and speaking. The study of history equips the citizen for his greatest usefulness in public service. A knowledge of mathematics is not only indispensable to the pursuit of other exact sciences, but is a necessary part of the preparation for many technical employments. Upon physics including chemistry rests the immense development of the modern mechanical and industrial arts; it is the knowledge of physics that makes the practice of these arts possible. The science of biology is brought into play in the practice of rural economy, it throws light on the habits of animals and plants, and is more and more needed to prevent disease and promote health. Philosophy is the background of intelligent living and of the intelligent pursuit of science; every one has his philosophy of life, his philosophy of conduct, and his philosophy of the world. Every science begins with philosophy and ends with philosophy. We are all philosophers of one kind or another, good, bad, or indifferent, by the very fact of being rational creatures. What we all need is to be educated philosophers, just as we need to be educated Christians. Music, painting, architecture, sculpture, make life worth living by developing and educating our capacities for enjoyment.

The multiplication and complexity of the subjects of the modern curriculum tend to obscure the outlines and the distinctiveness of the liberal arts idea and program. For example, the study of language with the Greeks meant learning to read, write, and speak Greek alone, but with the educated Romans of the Empire it meant the study of two languages, both Latin and Greek. Still later after the fall of the Roman Empire and the establishment of separate nationalities throughout Europe, higher education added Latin and Greek to the study of the native tongue; then the group of modern languages was added to the curriculum. Now, the language department of one of our fully equipped universities provides instruction in the Semetic languages, in the Classics, the Romance languages, German, Scandinavian, Slavic, etc. So, too, the arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy of the *Quadrivium* have expanded into algebra, analytic geometry, calculus, the theory of numbers, theory of equations, and other more advanced branches of mathematics, physics, mechanics, engineering, astrophysics, cosmogony, geology, chemistry, biology, and various subdivisions. Philosophy is subdivided into ethics, psychology, logic, and metaphysics. History has developed into sociology, politics, economics, and the history of the several languages, literatures, and sciences. In consequence of this multiplicity and in view of the various capacities and aims of students, the types of schools have also multiplied, and numerous elective courses have been added to the curriculum. Besides the universities and colleges, there are the professional schools, art schools, technical schools, vocational schools, industrial schools; all intended in various ways and degrees to educate men for living useful lives.

A survey of educational history and the present educational status gives added significance to the broad distinction between liberal and technical or vocational education. It is quite true that all kinds of technical education are more or less liberalizing, and that liberal education in the traditional

sense is a needed preparation for better performance in specific employments. The distinction rests rather upon a difference of aims and upon different conceptions of the purpose of human life; the one has in view the full nature of man and the development of all his faculties, his faculties of appreciation as well as his faculties of achievement; the other aims to secure efficiency in some special line of effort, thereby giving assurance of success in remunerative employment; we may characterize the one as liberalizing, the other as specializing. But the distinction and contrast may be misleading if pushed too far. Education in the full sense of the word, a complete education, would be at once both liberal and special. In general, this result is secured by combining the benefits of the college and the technical school in the education of the individual, and this is usually and properly done by taking the college work first and then the technical school; our present system of schools makes ample provision for such a course, within the limits of general literature and science. But from the point of view of a complete human life, the education furnished by our school system has obvious and intolerable deficiencies, and without magnifying these, we are bound in loyalty to our ideal to give them serious attention.

First of all, in spite of its admirable scientific breadth and variety, modern education is viciously narrowed by its predominant naturalism, especially in our institutions of higher education. Naturalistic preconceptions, prejudices, and interests pervade and prevail in all branches of science and in all interpretations of history; even religion and the Bible are subjected to naturalistic methods, standards, and explanations. The result is that for the most part the Bible is relegated to the class of national literatures, when not consigned to the waste basket; and religion is reduced to a case of natural evolution, a purely human product. To put this conclusion in shocking but quite appropriate terms, it would be, in terms of naturalism, true to fact to say that man created God rather than to say that God created

man. The attitude of the so-called educated mind of the day towards religion is fairly well depicted by recent carefully prepared statistics to the effect that 50% of college and university teachers in selected departments and about the same percentage of the students in the higher classes are either merely indifferent to religion, or are positive agnostics and infidels. This is the atmosphere which our young people enter when they go to the colleges and universities around us; into these waters of naturalism and materialism they plunge; some swim, more perhaps sink. It is easy, consoling, and self-satisfying to say that the conditions are transitional, that the higher education of the day is uprooting hurtful prejudices, traditional opinions, and false ideas; and that such naturalism is laying firmer foundations for a more rational spiritualism. In short, that we should see in these conditions a fuller preparation for the New Jerusalem. If our colleges and universities were devoting themselves conspicuously to spiritual reconstruction, rather than to destructive criticism, and to undermining religious dogma, we could look on with some degree of equanimity, if not confidence; and we could indulge our fancies as to the outcome. But the case is too serious for easy-going optimism. We cannot take the first step in spiritual reconstruction by destroying faith in God, the Bible, and immortality, even though we may find satisfaction in the assurance that it is the traditional dogmas that are relegated to the dark ages. If we were more serious and more widely and deeply observant we would wake up to the fact that it is a case of undermining religious faith, and in particular the Christian faith, rather than overthrowing traditional dogmas; and moreover, it is a case of merely substituting one dogma, namely, scientific dogma, for another, for religious and Christian dogma. The truth is that what is really going on is the working of a strongly fortified naturalistic philosophy, which is as arrogant, as sectarian, and as oppressive to freedom of thought, as was the Roman Catholic hierarchy of the Middle Ages. The spirit of naturalism is

so subtle, so pervasive, and so dominant in our day, that even our strongest men, our leaders in school and Church, are its easy and helpless victims. The religion of the day is still dogma, the free thought of the day is in principle and in method naturalism. Free spiritual thinking is yet to come.

This is the situation, then, in which religious and thoughtful people now find themselves. This is the atmosphere of our schools and of our education; it is needless to go into detail. Both education and religion, and therewith practical life, must be lifted to a higher level, above the clouds of the world, into the light of the new day. We of the New Church have an inestimable advantage in the upward struggle, but the success of our struggle and the level we attain depend upon the use we make of our advantage. We cannot swim with the current and at the same time rise to higher levels.

First of all, we have a system of doctrine, dogma if you please, which furnishes us higher principles of life. The mere possession of the system with acceptance of its dogmatic truth and loyalty to its principles constitutes an immense advantage. Even as mere dogma, it lifts us above the scientific and religious dogma of the day, into an enlarged and consistent universe which contains both the natural and the spiritual world, a universe of which God as the one only Divine Man, infinite Love and Wisdom, is the center, source, and directive power.

But our doctrinal system was given us to be understood and applied. It is not enough to know the doctrine, though that is necessary; we do not really possess it, nor can we be truly loyal to its principles, unless we are able to understand and apply it, at least to the measure of our capacities and opportunities. What are our capacities and opportunities? We cannot say what our capacities are until they are developed, and educated to the highest degree; education itself gives opportunities, and the higher the education the higher and greater the opportunities. We now have the

formula for our theme, The higher the education the higher and greater the opportunities.

Human life is at once a process of education and of making use of the education as it is acquired. Reference has already been made to that inevitable education which we all get by the mere fact of living in the environment, and reacting to its influences. We have also seen that this natural education has many and serious defects, and to realize the full purpose of life needs to be extended, and directed by systematized methods and institutions. It is in this way that our lives are highly and specifically developed, rationally and practically enlarged, and freed from various natural and artificial limitations. The result we call liberal education, for the reason that it brings into free exercise all the powers of the man and puts him in the position to make the best use of himself; he thereby becomes not merely a worthy citizen of the state, but a true citizen of the world.

We are here reminded that our theme is "The Type of School Needed for a Proper New-Church Education"; and we cannot forget that education is life and for life, that is to say, that every step of education is preparation for a higher step, and a larger life. What we need, therefore, is a more definite statement of what we mean by New-Church education and New-Church life.

To begin with, we must be sure to think of New-Church life as life in the world, the physical and practical world, as well as the world of sentiments, abstract ideas, and principles. To live fully and freely in the world we must know the world, which means that inasmuch as we are born in ignorance we must learn little by little what the world is and what it contains. As we grow in knowledge, the world gets a larger and larger meaning. The physical, social, moral, and intellectual world gradually yields in importance to that world which we know, and in which we live, by virtue of the fact that we are *spiritual* beings, and not merely highly developed animals. As spiritual beings we are pri-

marily and supremely interested in the spiritual world; this explains why children are so eager to learn about God and heaven, and why they retain such knowledge beyond all other. It is our relations to the spiritual world, the world of our immortal selves, and our relations to God, the direct fountain of spirit, which we gather together under the word religion. But our religion is not mere contemplation nor mere sentiment, it binds us to men as well as to God; by virtue of our nature as spiritual beings, we live in our religion and from our religion, or in violation of our religion, every moment of our busy lives. Here we have the guidance of our principle, "All religion has relation to life, and the life of religion is to do good." This means that religion is not something apart from active practical living, but is the spirit, motive, light, and directive force in such living; and "to do good" in this statement means first to do what is good in the Lord's sight and in the light of His truth, and then as a consequence to do what is kindly and socially beneficial. In short, the principle requires us to put our religion into practice in every relation of life, personal, domestic, social, civil, and especially in the work of our calling.

Our education must fit us for life both in the spiritual and in the natural world; it must fit us for some specific employment as well as for social and civil life; and most of all it must fit us for marriage and domestic life. Human life normally begins and ends in the home; the child is born into the love and care of husband and wife, and after a period of growth and education enters marriage, and in marriage and by marriage progresses throughout eternity. This is the Divinely instituted course of human life, and for such life education as the early stage is immensely important. At this early stage, body and mind are growing and developing with wonderful rapidity; the senses are getting distinctness, training, accuracy, and range, and are made more and more perfect instruments of the higher faculties of mind; inclinations, dispositions, opinions, tastes, judg-

ment, habits are forming and becoming fixed; practical skill and intellectual power are brought into exercise; moral and spiritual insight and experience are moulded to the purposes of life; the field of knowledge and the range of interests are immensely expanded; the personality is enlarged and consolidated, and made ready for some chosen career. There is no end to the development of all these various capacities and functions, but there is a time in this general process of expansion and education when the practical interests take definite shape and direction; this is the point of decision as to one's life work, the occupation one is to pursue for a livelihood and as one's special form of service to the community. There is here a natural division between the period of growth, development, training, preparation, and the period of application and achievement in one's chosen vocation. The word education usually and specifically means the work of the earlier period, when all the activities of body and mind are more or less subjected to the control and direction of parents and schools, and so the word means more definitely the work of the schools. The question is, therefore, what type of school is required to accomplish the purposes of education within the school period. Here we recognize three natural and important stages in the development of youth; they are roughly indicated by the ages seven, fourteen, and twenty-one. In the first period the senses and the imagination are predominantly active; in the second, the memory is stored; in the third, the rational interests and powers come into play and take the lead. These facts furnish the principles in accordance with which the work of the schools is organized and the pupils classified. The grades are designated Primary, Grammar, High School, and College. A school system organized in accordance with New-Church principles, has unparalleled advantages in all these grades. The new light on the psychological and spiritual constitution of the child, in particular the "Doctrine of Remains," gives untold advantages in directing education in the primary grades. So, too, a knowledge of the psy-

chological and spiritual functions of memory is an inspiration and a guide in organizing the grammar grades and dealing with the individual pupils of these grades. This knowledge is all the more important at the present time because of the disposition in some quarters to neglect the opportunity to exercise and train the memory, and store it with materials and habits which are indispensable to the further and upward progress of life. In religious instruction, in the study of history and the sciences, there is much unavoidable and highly important memory work to be done as a necessary basis for secure and rapid progress. There is, of course, at this stage, and even in the primary stage, an appropriate amount and degree of understanding to be developed. In fact, the functions of the stages above indicated are marked rather by relative than by exclusive importance. Even in infancy, the work of memory goes on actively and effectively in building up stable groups of impressions, not merely of sense, but at the same time of moral, intellectual, and spiritual character. The education of childhood involves all this.

In the high school and college period the function of rationality is predominant, but the work of receiving impressions and storing the memory continues with unabated zest and importance. There is, however, an extraordinary expansion of mind and of personality at this stage. The flood of emotions sweeps forward, the creative imagination stirs and quickens the mental functions, interest in abstract ideas and ideals and the power to deal with them constructively develop with amazing variety and force. This is the period when great concrete and personal interests, such as religion, philosophy, science, and business, take form and direction, and become the motive power of the life's work. All these interests need to be recognized, instructed, enlightened, and directed. The New Church has in its possession a marvellously complete body of doctrine about the nature and the functions of rationality. These functions are exercised in various fields and at various levels. Very early in

life we have the perceptions of space relations, then the relations of persons and the more complex social relations, also the highly complicated relations involved in the study language and the sciences. But the exercise of most general importance is the perception of the relations between the spiritual world and the natural. At this point the function of rationality becomes of the greatest educational importance; and our doctrines throw abundant light on the spiritual character of rationality and on its supreme importance for spiritual development. According to Swedenborg, the highest exercise of rationality is the perception of the relations of means to ends, and of causes to effects. By this exercise we are able to form conceptions of God and immortality. Herewith we enter intellectually into the mysteries of faith; and the deepest mystery of faith, and of life, is the gift of freedom and rationality; for that which makes man to be man is the rationally free acceptance and use of the Lord's Love with its Wisdom and Power. This is the starting point of religion as well as the starting point of life. To live in the full light of this fact is the climax of educational achievement.

We have now sketched in brief and rapid outlines the course of New-Church education. We have found the distinctive feature of this education to be the fullness and completeness of its spiritual instruction. We have noted some of the points where this instruction enters the ordinary daily school curriculum. The question now is what is the type of school, or school system, needed for such education. The considerations above presented lead to the conclusion that a New-Church school when fully developed and equipped would comprehend all grades of pupils from primary to college. It would undertake to form of the pupils complete men and women, by educating, as far as possible, all their faculties, practical, moral, æsthetic, intellectual, and spiritual. Even under the most favorable circumstances, the conditions of school life impose certain limitations upon education in this large sense. One of these limitations is

that the pupils must be dealt with by classes, not as individuals. When we undertake to develop all the faculties of the child to the highest point of efficiency, we are confronted with two practically insurmountable obstacles. In the first place, we are, at the outset, in almost complete ignorance of what the specific endowments of a given child are. We may give a rough guess on the basis of our general knowledge of the human constitution and some knowledge of his heredity, but we can definitely ascertain his aptitudes and capacities only by trying them out in the process of education itself. Our school system is to a large extent this trying-out process; but in the end, many a student comes to graduation without discovering what his specific endowments are, what he is really fitted for. We actually solve this problem by taking the average, and constructing our curriculum with reference to what we conceive as the normal child. But aside from our initial *ignorance*, another obstacle almost as baffling is the *multiplicity* of gifts with which the individual is endowed; one has an aptitude for mathematics, another for languages, one is endowed musically, another for literary production, one for public speaking, another for some technical employment or commercial leadership, and so on indefinitely. Not only may all these gifts be possessed by the student body or by the several classes, but they may all be concentrated in a single individual. The school must meet these educational demands as far as possible, and this is done by again striking the average, and by framing the curriculum so as to provide for the most general and important lines of development.

The problem which the curriculum undertakes to solve is a highly complicated one. On the one hand, there is the undetermined multiplicity of aptitudes, tastes, capacities, and purposes of the student body, which make it practically impossible to meet all the demands. On the other hand, the bewildering multiplication of *subjects* which are possible objects of interest and study presents a situation closely parallel to the multiplicity of talent and capacities. Recent

efforts to cope with this twofold problem have led to the indefinite extension of the elective system and to the establishment of schools of the most varying types. Our great universities and large colleges meet the variety of demands by employing a numerous staff of teachers and by offering many courses and subdivisions of courses. This is an approximate solution, but it labors under grave defects which are from the point of view of higher and complete education intolerable; obviously it places undue responsibility upon undeveloped tastes and immature judgment, and even more seriously it neglects inevitably the proper education of many faculties which are left dormant, and whose well trained and fully developed functions are indispensable to the man at his best.

A properly organized New-Church school would have inestimable advantages in undertaking to remedy these defects. The greatest of these advantages is that it would have in full view the whole nature of man, and could shape its curriculum accordingly. It could embody in its curriculum the principles, the methods, and the details of a liberal education far more completely than is done in the curricula of the day or than has been done in the "Liberal Arts" curriculum of tradition. A glance at the field of knowledge enables us to make certain broad but important distinctions; we have, for example, the familiar domains of the sciences, language and literature, history, philosophy, and religion. It is true that each of these domains is inexhaustible, and would require the life-long devotion of the most robust student to compass, but a general introduction to all these domains is within the easy range of a well regulated curriculum, and easily within the powers of the ordinary student. Such an introduction would give full freedom for further pursuit, and for adequate appreciation of the latest advances, in any of these directions; and this is the specific aim and result of a liberal education. When we pass to the special branches of these great subjects, we encounter the problems of *selection and co-ordination.* Here, too, the

New-Church school would have the peculiar advantage of a more complete knowledge of the universe as a whole and of man in particular. The wide sweep of the doctrines of Creation, Degrees, Correspondence, and Influx would make it comparatively easy to assign the proper relative values to the subjects of the curriculum. Physics for example would have a distinctly human and spiritual value by virtue of the position of nature in the series of degrees and of its correspondence with the spiritual world. The atmosphere of the study of physics and the kind of personal interest in it would be altogether different from that of the mere natural science. The mind would be lifted and directed upward with every successive step in advance. The wonders and mysteries of radio-activity would be no less stimulating to deeper study of the ultimate constitution of matter, but they would also point to the spiritual nature of the forces which are exhibited in the behavior of these almost inconceivably minute bodies. The same upward look would characterize all the natural history sciences, such as geology, biology, and especially astronomy where "the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork." Even the abstract science of mathematics would pass into logic, logic into psychology, and psychology into religion; while language, history, the moral and the social sciences would be studied as the special theatre of Divine and human purpose. In this way, the curriculum would at once express the purpose of life and serve as a preparation for continuing that purpose and directing it to the specific ends of the individual; it would survey adequately the field of knowledge, and thus fulfill the instinct for acquiring knowledge, and it would make the knowledge serviceable by organizing it with reference to human welfare and progress. It would inform and train the mind for intellectual labor and for appreciation of the world, and especially the human world both as it is and as it ought to be. The curriculum should be co-extensive with human interest; it should lift the mind and direct the affections to the Lord, and from knowledge and

love of the Lord should lead to the understanding of nature and of man, and through this to the service of the Lord and of mankind.

In accordance with these principles, the curriculum of a New-Church School would assign the first place to religious instruction, based upon a systematic study of Swedenborg's life and writings. With this help, the Lord's Word would be read, interpreted, and applied to life. As a preparation for religious instruction and for its application in filling positions of usefulness in the work of the world, the curriculum would provide instruction in language and literature, in history, in the sciences, and in philosophy. These are merely easy and natural extensions of the knowledge of every child; as soon as the child learns to read, he is introduced into every one of these fields; the work of the school is to aid, systematize, and carry his progress on to advanced stages. The book of science lies before him when he first opens his eyes upon the world of colors. With his growth, the objects of zoology, botany, physics, chemistry, geology, astronomy, and strange glimpses into psychology and metaphysics become familiar to him. Even his early lessons in mathematics and logic are well learned before he enters the primary grade. What the school does is to systematize this knowledge and direct its extension.

In view of the immense field of knowledge and the multiplicity of its divisions, the curriculum must *select* and *co-ordinate*. Among the languages of immediate importance for social intercourse, for mental training, for literature and for history, are, besides the native tongue, the Semetic languages, Greek, Latin, the Romance Languages, especially French, and the language most akin to our own, German. In approaching the sciences, we naturally and properly begin with the most abstract and universal, mathematics, which is not only indispensable for any scientific progress, but is today in its most advanced stages one of the most fascinating and creative of all the sciences; it carries the mind to the highest reaches of generality and is at the same time the

model of scientific precision. After mathematics, and as the stepping stone to the study of the intimate structure of nature, we have, of course, physics and its closely knit ally chemistry. The study of physics expands inevitably to astronomy, cosmology, geology, geography, and to its many and important applications in mechanics. With geography and mechanics, we come to the human world and to the world of animated nature, to the great body of human industry and the distribution of animals and plants. Here the great problems of life in external nature and in man meet us, and we have the sciences of biology, sociology, psychology, logic, ethics, metaphysics, not to mention the historical sciences, and the many technical sciences. The claims of art are provisionally distributed to music, drama, painting, architecture, and sculpture.

Herewith, then, we have our curriculum covering all grades and, according to Jefferson's maxim in laying the foundations of the University of Virginia, providing instruction of the highest degree in all the great branches of human knowledge. In the organization for carrying out this curriculum, our attention is directed critically to the highest grades, what we call the college grades. The number of subjects taught in these grades is, of course, largely a matter of development; but we may properly consider the minimum needed for a well rounded and advanced New-Church education. Selecting from the subjects above mentioned the most fundamental and comprehensive, we may set down: 1. English; 2. Hebrew, 3. Greek, 4. Latin, 5. French, 6. German, 7. Mathematics, 8. Physics, 9. Chemistry, 10. Biology, 11. Sociology, 12. Psychology, 13. Philosophy, 14. History, 15. Art, 16. Religious Instruction. This curriculum calls for a faculty of at least 16 highly educated teachers, one each for the subjects named, and it would be possible for such a faculty to give thorough and comprehensive instruction in all these great branches of knowledge. No one would question, for example, that Gildersleeve, Roland, Remsen, and Silvester at Johns Hop-

kins could give thorough and comprehensive instruction in Greek, Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics. It is true that each of these subjects could be expanded and subdivided almost indefinitely, and a corresponding enlargement of the faculty would be necessary. Nevertheless, the type of school constituted by these 16 departments would furnish the kind and degree of education needed for a well rounded and advanced New-Church education, and for the educated man of the world. It is a scheme of liberal education of the broadest and highest type, but naturally and properly it stops short of the professions and of specialization. The technical, professional, and graduate schools of the highly equipped institutions around us would be sufficient and ample for all post-graduate and special needs. In view of these conditions, it is plain that our School could preserve its type without any modification in principle, though no doubt assistant teachers would be needed. A school of this type could keep abreast of the most recent advances in all branches of science, and organize the results in the instruction of its several departments; it could preserve complete contact with the life of our own age as well as with the past. Every subject would be taught in its historical, logical and philosophical context. Religious instruction would be given in the light of history, philosophy, Swedenborg's Life and Work, and of the spiritual meaning of the Bible.

An institution of this kind is a primary need and an indispensable agency for the welfare, progress, and influence of the Church. For the lack of the kind of education such an institution would give, all the activities of the Church have been dwarfed, our increase has been retarded, our work in the world has been disappointing and ineffective. Such an institution is the present and crying need of the Church. Our young people must have this kind of education if they are to take their due place in the world of thought and action. A school of this type would be an inspiration and an object lesson to the school system around

us; it would present a type of education worthy of the Church, which would be recognized on all sides as unique and as in the highest degree excellent. It would take its position in the front ranks of the educational institutions of the world.

Practically such a school is within our reach; the only thing needed in the last analysis is interest and appreciation.

Lewis F. Hite.

SWEDENBORG AND THE SEXUALITY OF PLANTS*

I. By F. A. Gardiner

THE interesting details of differentiation in biological phenomena contained in the article under the above heading by Rev. Charles A. Hall in the April issue of the New-Church Review, consistent as they are in affording evidence that the botanist utilizes the term sex in the vegetable kingdom for an apparently analogous purpose to that for which it was and is used in the animal kingdom where it originated, do not prove that Swedenborg was wrong in his use of the word "male," or in the significance he attaches to its function when correctly understood.

I happen to be a Fellow of the Linnæan Society (London), and have had the opportunity of asking the opinion of distinguished botanists upon Swedenborg's use of the term "male." They have told me that from Swedenborg's point of view he was correct. Their adoption of the terms "male" and "female" in relation to the prolification of plants is justified because there are no other words so well

*Editors' Note.—It is not the policy of the Review to publish controversial articles. The series herewith presented on Swedenborg and the Sexuality of Plants, while dignified and courteous in tone and substance, is controversial to the extent of being written to refute the positions taken in the recent article by the Rev. Charles A. Hall (see Review for April of the current year). The Editors of the Review think it important to submit such positions to full and fair criticisms. Accordingly, this series of articles is published to acquaint our readers with the positions which some of our earnest and prominent New-Church brethren of England hold. Further discussion of the facts and principles involved will be welcome; but the Editors desire that contributors shall avoid personal controversy.

adapted to describe the phenomena. They have challenged me to suggest terms better fitted for the purpose, and I have agreed that the botanist is, under the circumstances, justified in so employing the words. Natural language is a poor instrument for expressing precise, definite and exclusive meanings and ideas.

In the animal kingdom, where the words originated, if the male and female fill their function completely, an offspring is the result; in the vegetable kingdom, if the pistil and stamen fill their function completely, *seed* is the result, [but not a plant]. Mr. Hall actually states that in his opinion a seed is a plant. I suggest that correctly speaking, a seed is no more a plant than an egg is a bird, or an unborn child is a man; and the fact that the logical conclusion of his working proposition is to prove that a seed is a plant is evidence that his syllogism is not founded on real facts.

If I may be allowed to say parenthetically here, the article of Mr. Hall is of psychological interest. He says that "a fertile imagination inspired by preconceived opinions enables the observer to imagine he sees what he expects or wants to see." I suggest that he himself is an illustration of that fact. Like all botanists he has been trained to use a terminology adopted by scientists to describe the phenomena dealt with; and possessing the imagination he finds what he looks for.

I submit that according to the nomenclature in use in Swedenborg's time the function of the male in the animal kingdom was to produce seed; and as a function of the vegetable kingdom is to produce seed, the vegetable kingdom as a whole, fills in its own plane, the role of a male.

The theories of the modern botanist developed since Swedenborg's time are not impervious to criticism. They tell us that, because seed in some cases discloses within itself the rudimentary forms of early plant life, therefore it is not a "seed" in the usual sense, but a plant. This is an etymological inexactitude which has to be adopted to justify wished-for conclusions.

While we recognize the exigencies of the botanist in his selection of terms to mark his progressive knowledge, and must concede his right to use them in a modified sense for the purpose of elaborating the result of his researches into the mechanism of nature, we must not permit such modifications to give rise to confusion by overlooking what their full and true meaning is, at their source and origin; doing so leads in the present instance to an inadvertent misrepresentation of the true significance of Swedenborg's statements.

Swedenborg was correct in using the term "male" as he did. When botanists applied it to a lower plane of life they would have been more correct to have used the word "quasi-male," but we excuse their not having thus qualified the term.

F. A. GARDINER.

II. By G. E. HOLMAN

IN an article in the April number of the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, the Rev. Charles A. Hall deals with the subject of the reproduction of plants and, incidentally, with the question of heredity in men and animals. He presents his readers with the scientific view of these matters and, so far, the article is an interesting and useful one. But the scientific view is necessarily only a superficial one. The Writings of the New Church give us the spiritual view, which is of course the only true view. When rightly understood, it must harmonize with the observed facts of science, although it will not necessarily harmonize with scientific theories. Indeed, it will probably *not* harmonize with most scientific theories, because those theories are based on a superficial view only.

To take the most important question first. The Writings give us, as an "arcanum" revealed from heaven, the doctrine that in the reproduction of the human species the soul is from the father and the body from the mother (True

Christian Religion, n. 103). Mr. Hall assumes that Swedenborg obtained this doctrine from Aristotle. Aristotle certainly held it, in common with other writers of antiquity, although where they obtained it is unknown. It may have been handed down, by tradition, from the doctrines of the Ancient Church in the East. Be that as it may, it is now given to us as a divine truth, specially revealed as an integral portion of that organic body of spiritual truths given to the world by the Lord at his Second Advent. Mr. Hall remarks that "On the physical side there is no question that both mother and father contribute characters to the bodily form of their offspring." This is, of course, true. But where does this conflict with the statement of the Writings? The spermatozoa have a material external. This is merely to serve as a vehicle for the paternal soul-offshoot. The qualities of the embryo soul are of course expressed in the body. It is clear, according to the most elementary teachings of the New Church, that spiritual activities, when clothed in matter, mould that matter into correspondence with themselves, and it is obvious that when the soul is furnished with external substances from the mother, it will form a body to itself which shall represent its own characteristics. The whole of the paternal character will be represented in the body of the child, whether obviously so or not. It is quite possible, however, that, to ordinary observation, the maternal peculiarities may be represented almost exclusively. For when Swedenborg says that the "body" is from the mother, he does not mean merely the material body. That term includes not only the dead material but also that lowest plane of spirit which is specially associated with material substances and forces and comprises the three degrees of life of the natural world referred to in "Divine Love and Wisdom," n. 66, and also in "Last Judgment" (Post.), n. 313. All the material and lower spiritual substances are furnished by the mother, and those substances are formed in the offspring in accordance with the external mentality of the mother. It is in this lower plane of spirit

that evils reside. If only the dead material substances of the body of the Lord had been derived from the Virgin Mary, how could He have inherited all those tendencies to evil by means of which He underwent temptations? Those higher spiritual substances and forms, however, which constitute the "soul" are derived from the father alone, though they probably are modified in the child by the reactive influence of the body derived from the mother. There is not one jot of evidence which should lead us to doubt this cardinal teaching of the revelation given to the New Church. The whole doctrine of the Incarnation stands upon the teaching that the soul is from the Father and the body from the mother. And yet Mr. Hall says that Swedenborg's statements "now seem almost ridiculous"!

The three natural degrees of life or spirit which the child inherits from its mother along with the physical body, are the same low spiritual degrees as go to form the souls of animals in this world. In looking at the subject from the standpoint of science, it has to be remembered that most of the experimental knowledge concerning heredity is obtained from the breeding of animals, which do not possess a spiritual soul in the true sense of the word. Though even in animals, at any rate the higher animals, there is probably the distinction that the father provides the highest of the three natural degrees and the mother the lower degrees or degree and the material substances.

We must remember, too, that all revelation has a human side; and Swedenborg, when giving to the world the magnificent truths of the New Revelation, often added illustrations which, though seemingly good in his day, have since been shown not to be admissible. Such an illustration is that given in "Divine Providence," n. 277, to which Mr. Hall refers, that the child of a negro by a white woman is born black, and vice versa. This faulty illustration, however, does not invalidate the truth of the revealed doctrine.

Then as regards the sex of plants. In "True Christian Religion," n. 585, it is stated that all plants are male and

that the earth is their common mother. It might be assumed that Swedenborg was unaware that plants possessed what we call male and female reproductive organs. This is not so. His knowledge of vegetable physiology was, of course, not so perfect as that of the present day, but that he recognized the parallelism between the reproductive processes of animals and plants is clear from what he states in his work on *Generation,* in the chapter on *The Fallopian Tubes,* written long before the "True Christian Religion." He also refers in "Divine Love and Wisdom," n. 61, to vegetable reproduction being due to a process "akin to marriage."

But the parallelism is not perfect. The general view is that a plant seed or fruit contains an embryo and is equivalent to the egg of an insect, reptile or bird. But while the egg will be hatched without any mothering beyond the requisite supply of heat or light, the plant seed requires (under natural conditions) the influence of mother earth. The earth does not merely supply nourishment, for "in earths there is an effort to produce uses in forms." (Ibid., n. 310-312.) Plants may be reproduced by cuttings, as in the carnation, potato, or begonia. At first sight this seems analogous to the fact that the common Hydra, when cut in two, will become two complete individuals. But here again, while the animal Hydra "cutting" will grow into a perfect Hydra of itself, plant cuttings require to be planted in the earth or they at once die. Even from the superficial or scientific point of view the analogy between the animal and vegetable reproductive processes is not complete.

But the purpose of the Writings is to take us beyond the surface of things and to show us spiritual causes. All sex distinctions are reflections of the distinction between Divine Love and Wisdom. These divine attributes are, in the Creator, "distinctly one," but in all finite things they are received separately. In the human being they flow, as a life-giving stream, into the Will and Understanding, and in animals they flow into the animal analogues of will and un-

derstanding, i. e., affection and knowledge. Each sex possesses both will and understanding, but the will is preponderant in the female and the understanding in the male. Therefore the male represents the understanding and the female the will. Every human being and animal possesses both will and understanding (or their analogues) and these two receptacles of the Divine Love and Wisdom are represented in every part of the mind and body. But the members of the vegetable kingdom do not possess Will or anything analogous thereto. They are said therefore to grow rather than to live. Their life, such as it is, is purely external and is the outcome merely of the Understanding of the inhabitants of the spiritual world. The vegetable kingdom has Understanding for its cause, corresponds to the Understanding, and is therefore male only. In "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 3220, Swedenborg writes:—

> "When the angels discourse about the things of intelligence and wisdom and about perceptions and knowledges, the influx from it . . . falls into representations of such things as are in the vegetable kingdom, such as paradises, vineyards, forests, meadows with flowers in them."

This seems to be the real reason, or at any rate the main reason, why plants are, in the Writings, said to be male only.

G. E. Holman.

III. By Andrew Eadie

THERE is an article by the Rev. C. A. Hall in the April number of the New-Church Review on the sexuality of plants. I have read and re-read it and have inwardly tried to digest it. It has not agreed with me and I am far from being comfortable. It is disturbing and distressing.

The tone of the article is patronizingly apologetic. Mr. Hall seems to forget that Swedenborg was fully conscious

of the Spiritual World and was able to see effects from their causes, while modern botanists even with their most powerful microscopes are only able to study and see effects and can know little or nothing of causes.

The article seems intended to let Swedenborg down easily, and tacitly denies him any interior vision by accounting for his so-called mistaken statements by ignorance of natural facts now well known to modern botanists. In Mr. Hall's words the explanation seems to be "that he entirely misconceived the nature and function of the sëed."

The main statement on the Sexuality of Plants is made in "The True Christian Religion," the crowning work of Swedenborg's life, written in the fulness of his opened spiritual senses and after 27 years of spiritual experience "in a state of complete wakefulness." (True Christian Religion, n. 851.) Mr. Hall's positive statements and emphatic dismissal of Swedenborg's doctrine come as a severe shock to the believer in his mission. The question of sex in plants is not an essential doctrine of the New Church, but even on such a question I would rather found my thinking on the statements in "True Christian Religion" and in "Conjugial Love" than on the shifting sands of modern science. Modern science is in a state of flux and Mr. Hall admits that there is still "much to learn about the business of fertilization and reproduction." Modern science has no valid claim to finality on any one subject. Within recent years its foundations which twenty years ago were held to be so secure and solid have vanished, and some materialists have been frank enough to confess that the ground on which they stood has gone from under their feet. Botany especially is a study of externals, and no microscope made, or to be made, can do more than magnify externals and make *effects* plainer. Mr. Hall would probably admit all this and if so would it not be wise for New-Churchmen to maintain an affirmative attitude and seek an explanation on higher grounds that would not be derogatory to Swedenborg; or even "wait and

see," rather than assume the negatively dogmatic attitude that Mr. Hall has taken up?

I am not a botanist; I am in "dense ignorance" on the subject, and I cannot discuss the article from the scientific point of view, but I am troubled that the editor of the *New-Church Herald* is so emphatically negative, and I may be permitted to ask some questions and to make an occasional and modest assertion. (1) Has Mr. Hall not missed the point in his remarks on the paragraph from "True Christian Religion," n. 585, about "the common mother"? Swedenborg's point is "the common mother," but Mr. Hall brings in the fact that there are males in a hive, and in the Church male and female members. But his argument from these facts is quite beside the issue. The point is "the common mother." Is it not a fact that there is a "common mother" in a hive? Is it not a fact that the Church is a "common mother" to all her members,—male and female? (2) Is it not a fact that plants produce "seeds," and seeds only, and that plants of the parental type develop from these seeds under favorable conditions:—i. e. when planted in the earth? (3) Mr. Hall seems to confuse the words "seed" and "plant." On page 186 (sixth line from the bottom) he says:—"a sperm-cell unites with a germ cell, resulting in the ultimate formation of an embryonic plant destined, under favorable conditions, to grow and be a reproduction of the parental type." Then, a little further on he speaks of the "seed which contains the embryo." Again, on page 189 (the middle paragraph) he says:—"The fact of course is that the earth provides a soil in which a seed already containing an embryonic plant, can germinate. The first use of the soil is that it provides a local habitation for a plant." Is not the first use of the soil to provide a local habitation (a womb if you like) for a *seed?* Am I wrong in thinking that there is a "seed," and that a "plant" grows from that seed when planted in the soil (earth)? Mr. Hall seems to regard the two words as interchangeable, but is not a seed a seed, and a plant a plant? A seed is a potential plant; it

has the potency of a plant in it, and "under favorable conditions" it will grow and "be a reproduction of the parental type." But is not that true of all seeds whether vegetable or animal? Is the vegetable seed a plant in any sense in which the animal seed is not an animal? (4) Is Mr. Hall *quite sure* that "there is no correspondence between the seeds of plants and the masculine element"? (page 190, third paragraph). Man (vir) is both male and female. Essentially man (vir) is love and wisdom, and his seed, being an offshoot of his life, must be the result of the union of these interior male and female elements. Is not that seed just as embryonic as any vegetable seed? Has it not in potency all the human qualities, and will it not under favorable conditions grow and be a reproduction of the parental type? In that view is not the earth "the common mother" of all plants, and may not the sperm-cells and the germ cells be the correspondents of the love and wisdom in man, and must there not be two similar elements in the semen or seed in man (vir)?

It may well be that in the present state of our spiritual knowledge and of our botanical knowledge, we cannot find an entirely satisfactory solution of the difficulty; but I want to hold to the position that there is and must be a solution; a solution that will at once justify the statements in "True Christian Religion" and in "Conjugial Love," and also be harmonious with the real facts of natural science. A patient, thoughtful, affirmative, attitude will in time lead us to the truth, but a negative attitude, which dismisses the statement of "True Christian Religion" as good enough for 1770 but now quite out of date, and sets up the botanical facts of 1922 in opposition as the last word on the subject, will assuredly lead to doubts on deeper and more vital subjects under this spell. Like some scientific men, we shall try to divide our minds into two water-tight compartments; one for spiritual truths in which we have only an uncertain faith, and one for natural scientific knowledges which are our real belief and control our thinking. That way lies spiritual disaster.

ANDREW EADIE.

VOWEL SIGNIFICANCE

By J. T. Halleborg

THE distinctive function of speech is communication between men, therefore it is fitted to impart emotions, feelings and affections as well as those thoughts dealing with matter, quality, direction, etc. It appeals to the sense of hearing mainly by the vowel and consonantal sounds of the voice though it also affects the senses of sight and touch through gesture movements of the vocal organs, the face, hands and body. In fact, human speech is finely representative of not only man's physical and mental content but his very life. T. Merz in his "Fragment on the Human Mind" (Edin. 1919, p. 283), says:

> On examination it will be found that nearly all the words we employ have their origin in definite sensations with a spatial definition. There is only one exception to the general correctness of this remark, and this is to be found in the special language which is based upon sound: musical sounds in their harmony and melody have no reference to the outer world of space, but in and through them we are able to communicate to others and enjoy with them our feelings and emotions; and this is the reason why they are peculiarly adapted to form the language of the emotions.

We are, in our ideas on religion, philosophy, and science, today, more or less swinging away from the dead level of materialism to the recognition not only of mental imponderables but also of spiritual ones. Some of our ablest thinkers are now investigating and re-examining phases of experience with which our advances in material and mathematical sciences have brought us more sharply than ever into contact. Such subjects as Psycho-physics, Psycho-analysis, Hypnosis, Control of matter by mind, Psychical Research, and the like, are now made fields of serious exploration. Swedenborg has not, as yet, attracted the attention he de-

serves, for he has put before the world an entirely unique view of spiritual things and a philosophy that should challenge respectful attention. His views are truly religious, philosophic, and, in a refined sense, strictly scientific. His works, especially his "Arcana Cœlestia," are filled with valuable observations on speech in general. His illustrations from the spirit world, whether we receive them as real or imaginary experiences, are most suggestive, thought provoking, and psychologically stimulating.

In all unstudied speech, men recognize feelings by tones of voice, even though words are not understood. Animals, too, understand our tones, our gestures, and the emotions our facial muscles display. Swedenborg tells us that tones mark the affections while tongue or contact sounds involve intelligence. Now, in speech, vowels are the tone-bearers and convey the music of the voice. They express the emotions, those emotions that move and *affect* us inwardly and are therefore appropriately called the *affections*. And these affections all go toward making up the basic love to which one is attuned; in fact, gentle speech uttered by a loving voice *is* music from spiritual sources, and representative of angelic speech which is music itself. In medical science today, appropriate music is often used as a cure for the insane; a clear indication that science appreciates, though it may not formulate, this fundamental difference between vowels and consonants.

Consonants (with-sounders), or contact sounds, are the carriers in speech of whatever knowledge a man may have to impart. They are made by the comings together of parts of the more exterior organs of speech while vowels are from the interior organs, though rounded out in the mouth and the nasal cavities. Consonants, says Swedenborg, are not used in heavenly speech, for, so far as they have vocalized speech at all in heaven, they employ vowels only, never consonants. However, angelic speech is in many ways most different from and therefore not comparable with our earth tongues. Now, in our modern languages, vowels are no

longer pure emotion-bearers because speech today has departed greatly from its earliest state. We now use our vowels very much, though not entirely, in the same manner as we use our consonants or more mechanical vocal elements, and they are often made so necessary to the bald sense of our language apart from its feeling values that we should find it very difficult to understand our words at all, if, as was possible in oriental tongues, all the vowels in our written words were replaced by some one unclear sound such as the vague vowels in 'her,' 'sir,' 'son' and 'up,' where the letters e, i, o, and u are all pronounced so carelessly that they approach a mere vocal murmur. As all vowels, when indistinctly uttered, approach this vague sound, it is called the neutral vowel sound. Oriental tongues even today omit vowel symbols altogether and write only the consonant or contact sounds, leaving vowel sounds to be supplied by the reader. Such partially written word-forms might be called neutral vowel words. They are blank keys, so to speak, put forth by the intellect; forms to be filled out at will with whatever vowel sounds, or feeling values, the occasion demands before they can become living words.

No syllable of any speech whatever is at all possible without some sort of vowel sound, if only a vocal murmur, to make it pronounceable, just as there can be no full intelligence without something of feeling mingled with it, because we humans do not so much *know* as *feel*. In John Dewey's "Reconstructions in Philosophy," p. 6, we find:

> It is then overlooked that both rationality and irrationality are largely irrelevant and episodal in undisciplined human nature; that men are governed by memories rather than by thought, and that memory is not a remembering of actual facts, but is association, suggestion, dramatic fancy. The standard used to measure the value of the suggestions that spring up in the mind is not congruity with fact but emotional congruity . . . If we are willings to take the word *dreams* with a certain liberality, it is hardly too much to say that man, save in his occasional times of actual work or struggle, lives in a world of dreams rather than of facts, and a world of dreams that is organized about desires whose success and frustration form its stuff.

Swedenborg says that our speech is mere symbolizing of the ideas of thought which is really interior speech, and that every thought is composed of innumerable ideas. Further, that in every thought there is somewhat derived from the *will or love* as well as from the understanding. He gives us to understand that the *Will,* in its widest sense, is man's real, that is spiritual, motivation. So here we have the reason why any vocal speech at all would be impossible without vowel sounds running all through it. For Swedenborg says that man's life is his ruling love and that speech is but an expression, both voluntary and involuntary, of that love. And we must remember that both the neutral vowel and its lowest form, the vocal murmur, are vocals and therefore vowels in sound. Again, there are but few consonants, or contact sounds, that do not depend upon a vocal of some kind to make them pronounceable. So true is this that all ancient and many modern alphabets are syllabaries, each letter having attached to it (not written, yet understood) the vague or neutral vowel sound mentioned above. Our alphabet is, of course, not a syllabary, but we ourselves *name* our letters—bee, see, dee, eff, etc. We do not, as those of old often did, use our alphabetic names in sounding our words. We do not say, for instance, bee-aye-are, but *bar;* nor do we think of saying see-aye-tee, but we come out with the full cluster of sounds represented in *cat.* We group our speech sounds into words or phrases once for all; we make stable clusters of sounds which do not admit of being artistically colored by the exact vowel tint which the emotion of the moment calls for. But of old, they did that very thing. The Hebrews, for instance, wrote B-R which might be voiced, according to the place given to the neutral vowel, as: BuR, BuRu, uBur, BRu, etc., mere blank forms as we have said, which in actual speech became: bar, bara, ebar, bra, etc., as occasion demanded. Thus the old Hebrew script words were the merest husks of sound, or rather, they were short-hand speech-memoranda needing voice and gesture to make them true speech. And in the modern

Arabic writings there are no true vowel characters among the alphabetic symbols, through three of these letters, which really represent breathings, are called weak letters, and have a great affinity for the three fundamental, or rather most prominent, vowel sounds of human speech; ah, ee, and oo, better represented by A, I, and U. These Arabic letters are: Alif, a guttural breathing or hamzah which is related to A, that is, has an affinity for A; yá, a palatal which is akin to I; and wáw, a labial which comes close to w. No Arabic word begins with a vowel sound, it is always preceded by a breathing which is liquid in its nature and ever ready to become breathing, weak consonant, or vowel, as needed or demanded by its position in a word or sentence, for Oriental tongues pay great attention to what the French call liaison.

Both Hebrew and Arabic in the course of time gradually hardened into artificiality in their roots, which, from one, two, or three letter forms, finally became largely stereotyped into tri-literal forms which contained no true vowel, though they might have a weak letter like the Arabic above mentioned. But these tri-literal root forms were capable of assuming definite vowel values. For example: the model root F ′ L, where ′ represents a breathing or weak consonant, is given in Arabic grammars, and subjected to regular changes by inserted vowels. Any other root may be varied in like manner on this same model. Take for instance the root KTB and substitute K for F, T for ′ and B for L, then vocalize them according to the model forms of F ′ L, we get the parallel words as below:

Model, Fa ′ l Root form vocalized, Katb write or writing.

fa ′ al.....katab he wrote,
fu ′ il.....kutib it was written.
fa ′ il.....katib writer, scribe.
maf ′ ul.....maktub written, letter,
mafa ′ alah.....mukatabah, to correspond, etc., etc.

The two latter forms show how prefixes and suffixes were added. On this model, any root can form scores of words

which are easily understood without referring to the dictionary.

Here we see how vowels, breathings, and contact sounds take on pure sense values and are no longer three great classes representing feeling, mood, and sense qualities or relations, as in the original human type of speech. We must remember that writing is not an exact representation of true speech but just a string of symbols which merely outlines or, as it were, sketches real speech. To make the sketch living we must depend on the vocal or vowel part of our utterance to add a whole mass of values that the mere *vowel letters* do not give; such content as we understand by accent, modulation, rhythm, emphasis, and many other things—not to speak of such important matters as moods and the various shades of feeling like anger, doubt, question, etc. Our written letters omit the vital parts of self-expression, so that we need not wonder when we hear 'the mere letter' spoken of slightingly.

We see that Oriental writing with its unvocalized letters has its "raison d'être" and that even the modern forms of the Hebrew and Arabic with their system of points for vowels actually give them much more liberty of choice in expression than our writing does. But even in English a written sentence can be made to bear different meanings to accord with different modes of utterance. Intonation, cadence, modulation, stress, accent, and other speech factors, all of which fall upon the vowels to express, may vary our written meanings in manifold ways. This is true of every tongue;but eminently true is it of Hebrew that "The letter killeth but that the spirit giveth life." We can better understand in view of all this, how the Scriptures, even in the material sense, can have literal, historical, allegorical and other values, and also how these values as well as the higher spiritual and celestial senses can be bound up in the same outer wrapper. We can now see what Swedenborg means when he calls the vowel the soul of speech. He keeps on reminding us how the quality, in each of all the things we

can sense, is dependent on a true marriage of complementary parts: Love and Wisdom, Truth and Good, Spirit and Mind, Feeling and Intelligence; all these are so indissolubly united into pairs as to be meaningless, the one apart from the other. Just so those symbols that we call vowels and consonants must be married, the one to the other before we can have a true human language.

Modern Germanic Philology gives the vowel a subordinate place in speech, thereby agreeing with Von Humboldt who expressly said that consonants made words, while vowels merely eked out meanings. The Teutonic and other root forms into which German linguistic science, following Hindu grammarians, has resolved all Aryan speech, uses what it insists is the one general vowel, 'A', with its two extreme modifications, I and U, while at the same time laying little stress upon any of the three. Thus, the consonants or exterior mechanical sounds are insisted upon, while vowels which are the more interior sounds expressive of the real spirit of language are largely ignored. And yet there is great excuse for this manner of handling speech material, for, according to Swedenborg, it is undeniable that all modern speech, from times long anterior to Christ, has been steadily externalizing, so that today we find it difficult to recover the earlier stages of speech—difficult though not altogether impossible. But that is a long, long story, a tale of ancient days, which no science has yet begun to read. It is pertinent to note here, however, in extenuation of this philology, that modern High German is quite the harshest and most consonantal in sound of all European tongues; in sound, please note, though not in spelling, for the printed page tells us English speakers very little of foreign sounds. The Welsh, for instance, is a liquid, musical tongue though to the eye its printed form bristles with consonants far more than German does. The languages of South Europe, Italian, Greek, Spanish, etc., are quite vocalic, while our own and the Celtic tongues stand midway between these and the Teutonic languages.

Old Hebrew writing sets down just the bald symbols or letters, as we call them, leaving out, as we have seen, all that the flexible voice expresses and all that the mobile features and the limbs illustrate by gestures. Even the words are not separated from one another by spaces but are run into one continuous, whole, sentence-word. It is difficult for us to understand how a tongue so dependent as the old Hebrew was on vocal sounds, intonation, accent, gesture, and all else that goes to the making of vivid speech, could be written at all in this bare, casual way. And yet, it was so written, and it was plain enough to the Hebrew of old for whom it was written.

Now it is a fact that all the oldest literatures the world over were poetical in form, and were preserved from age to age through tradition by the poets, or the makers as they were called, whose duty it was to memorize and transmit them to their pupils. This they did in a most marvellously faithful fashion, preserving songs, legends, chronology and history, and handing them on to their successors verbatim. In all this they made far greater use of the vowels, the more flexible or fluid part of speech than they did of its consonantal or more static element. After this literature was written and came into the hands of the commonalty in mechanical shape instead of being passed on to posterity by the living voice, it was found that these written symbols were too clumsy for use in the fullness native to the older method, and inevitably the spirit of the older forms suffered even though many other advantages were secured by writing. Earlier written forms, then, were rather bare memoranda then full communications. The vowels being omitted, readers needed to know much of the subject handled and even more of its background, before they could get the full sense of the letter.

Swedenborg says of the original Hebrew Scriptures (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 4987):

> In the original tongue, one series is not distinguished from another by interstitial signs as in other tongues, but there appears,

as it were, what is continuous from beginning to end. The things which are in the internal sense are in like manner continuous, flowing from one state to another.

So, in the inspired Writings, it is this very fluency, this vowel quality, that the living voice of the reader had to supply by its inflowing natural emotions. Every jot and tittle of that text contained such thronging spiritual content that, though even the simplest of us can glimpse something, yet that full content will not be exhausted by the studies of even the highest celestial angels.

The written Hebrew, then, was just the exterior shell of the sense which served to mark the form of its content. That content flowed continuously over and around the letter form in such fashion that it would have needed such a host of vowels to express it that this, the more interior part of speech, had therefore to be implied since it was impossible to put it into script in full measure. Afterwards Hebrew became displaced as a living speech and the learned then found it necessary, in order to preserve the sense of their ancient writings, to bring them up to date, that is, in line with such tongues as written Greek for instance. So, they supplied accents, spacings of words with some punctuation, and they showed the vowels and breathings, or some of them, by an elaborate sysytem of dots and dashes written above, below and within the letters. But in so doing, they made their writing to some extent mechanical; and the flexible, unwritten, vivid part of the ancient Hebrew was thus partly lost and replaced by a rigid, learned or book Hebrew; and so it has come about that modern Hebrew with its vowel points is written very much like other modern tongues. However, notwithstanding this, Oriental languages, as a whole, are nearer the spontaneous speech of the more ancient folk than any of the tongues of Europe. Gesture, the most vivid part of speech, is more necessary to them than it is to Europeans since often a different gesture gives to the same oriental word a quite other value. Tradition, which has been made most abundant use of by the

learned Hebrews in their copying of the Word, has marvellously preserved the sense of the old Scripture, and through Swedenborg the Lord has put before us what the old Hebrews only very dimly saw, the spiritual sense, and made us aware of much fuller and quite other content than they ever suspected.

A glance at our written English will perhaps give us some clues, and help us to comprehend a faint something of the possibilities of the older Hebrew texts. We spoke above of the many things unavoidably left out of our modern written speech: gesture, rhythm, nice inflections of the voice, and all the other factors that go to make clear the moods, feelings, and the various emotions in the mind of the speaker. Nothing perhaps better illustrates these omissions than the fine interpretation of a Shakespearian play by a company of competent actors. Hearing and seeing them one begins to realize something of what was in the mind of the poet when he wrote the lines. The beautiful sentiments, the apt words and meaty sentences, are all made doubly vivid, and receive added content from the actions, the gestures, and the living, colorful voices of the stage people. We leave the theatre with the feeling that for the first time we have really caught the pith of the story and something of its full meaning.

Again, we never write our English *accents* though every word of our tongue has, as a vital part of it, its own particular voice stress. In fact, so necessary is this stress to English speech that our words are barely comprehended without it. A misplaced accent is often fatal to the sense, and a foreigner is seriously hampered by this accentuation. It is unmarked in print and he can find no rules anywhere to guide him in utterance. He is, therefore, forced to learn our intricate spellings and our mysterious accents separately for each word that he acquires. There is nothing else for him to do than to practice, practice, practice just as we ourselves had to do in a childhood now long forgotten. Take any English word and misplace its accents and you will

understand what we are trying to say: develope, facsimile, vinegar, particle, and difficulty, for instance, have been wrongly pronounced by foreigners, friends of our own, dév-el-ope, par-tíc-le, fac-sim-íle, vin-é-gar, and dif-fíc-ulty. One such derangement might easily void the sense of a whole paragraph and set us to surmising, just as we are often startled and diverted by the stage Irishman's accents: the-á-ter, char-ác-ter, bal-có-ny, etc. Again, many of our words are completely altered in meaning by putting the accent on different syllables: mín-ute, min-úte; cón-cert, concért; dé-cent, de-scént, etc.

In our English, more especially as it is spoken by the educated in southern England, the vowel is so subordinated and slurred that our spelling is made chaotic and completely at variance with pronunciation; this is mainly because of our poorly distinguished vowel sounds in speech. Not a single one of our vowels has just one clearly fixed speech value wherever found. On the contrary, each one may be sounded in from four to eight very different ways, and there is absolutely no rule to guide one in their utterance.

So, our vowels not only do not tell us much about moods or feelings when we see them in print, nor do they give us any hint of tones, further, as we have seen, they do not even function well as letters or symbols. From all this we may see that our own written English is greatly lacking when it comes to real speech expression. It tells us nothing of moods, feelings, or emotions; it omits gesture altogether; does not mark accent or modulation, and the vowels do not really give us tone values or even definite speech sounds. So in a very real sense, our writings are not truly English speech, and our speech science has erred and still errs greatly in laying too much emphasis on written speech. But even our spoken English is too often so slurred and so little varied that it is no wonder we at times find it hard to express ourselves or fully to understand another.

A closer analogy to the blank forms of the old Hebrew words is found in our short-hand systems of written Eng-

lish. These, besides leaving out all that is mentioned above, systematically omit vowels, and seldom even indicate the position of an omitted vowel. They not only give us no hint of syllabification but they either run their words together or leave out syllables or words entirely. In many respects, they tell us much less than the old Hebrew writing did, and yet an expert short-hand writer finds his system entirely commonplace and perfectly legible. He, like the old Hebrew, depends on context and puts life and spirit into his reading just as the old Jews did.

The differences between the languages of earth and the speech of the spiritual world, Swedenborg shows to be fundamental, and yet vocal sounds can be and are employed in that world, though not in our manner. Our vowels differ from consonants by their smooth, pure voice quality. Now, this fluent character of vowels is a peculiarity that is fundamental to all angelic speech. Indeed, Swedenborg tells us that such speech is not broken into parts as is human discourse, but that one thing or idea is most wonderfully continued into another on account of the marvellous fullness of angelic thought. Again, the speech of celestial spirits is a softly flowing modulation which makes melody of the words themselves. This pure vowel-like speech is theirs because heavenly speech is altogether an expression of Love.

Darmstetter, in his Historical French Grammar, gives us a most excellent definition of a vowel:

> A vowel is the sound produced by a current of air driven from the lungs through the larynx and against the vocal chords at its mouth, thus causing vibrations in the air. This current of air is unimpeded in the mouth and therefore results in a continuous sound which can be prolonged as long as the lungs continue to expel air. The sound thus produced is both a fundamental note *and a series of harmonies* whose number and intensity vary with the form assumed by the mouth cavity . . . Now, since the variations of the mouth cavity are infinite, therefore, we can have an infinite number of vowels.

Seven of this infinite number of vowels are so clear-cut that they seem to dominate all the rest. Five, indeed, are

in almost universal use throughout the world and may be said to be common to speech in general. These are the so-called Italian (not our English) vowel sounds of A, E, I, O, and U. The two others are our English sounds as heard in the words awe and arrow. We may symbolize these two latter by the turned capital U and the diphthong æ thus: Ո-awe and Æ-a. The neutral vowel sound, symbolized by a turned e, ə, is also quite universal. The seven clear-cut vowels mentioned above are best arranged as a natural scale thus: I, E, Æ, A, Ո. O, U, where A holds the central position since it dominates in the center of the mouth while I dominates at the extreme front and U at the extreme back part of the mouth.

By that false science which ever seeks to give an appearance of simplicity by stressing some one point at the expense of all others, A has been called the mother of all the vowels while I and U are assumed to have been the first born from A. This idea, no doubt, arose from the fact that there was only one symbol for vowel sounds in some of the ancient written tongues like Sanscrit. This one letter was certainly variously pronounced and after a time became differentiated into three symbols and then into more, as more exact written discrimination was made; I and U were first added to mark the extremes of the vowel scale, and later came the intermediates E and O. German philology mistakenly taught that Sanscrit was the oldest and best type of Aryan speech, and since A was there found to occur first in time it was supposed to have been the only vowel used in speech. This, of course, does not necessarily follow, as we have discovered since. Various vowels were undoubtedly used from the first though the early crude alphabets did not mark them. The truth is that all alphabets are even today exceedingly fragmentary in character and provide only for about half the sounds actually used in the speech of any particular tongue. Besides, we do not know positively the sound of any of the older symbols of speech. We can only guess at the sounds of the Greek and Latin letters and are

all at sea as to the value of the Anglo-Saxon letters. Ellis, our best authority, in his "Early English Pronunciation" is very full and fluent on the sounds of English letters at various periods in the life of our tongue, but even he confesses in more than one place that his dicta are founded on mere conjecture and hypothesis. In fact, when we look into the science of linguistics critically, we find that all its divisions: etymology, phonetics, semantics, comparative grammar, etc., are still seeking foundations, though the material collected is almost overwhelming in quantity.

Swedenborg has very much to say, passim, on language in general. Often he sets down, quite casually, certain observations that go to the very roots of speech and which, followed up by a fully equipped scholar of the subject, could put a truer order into many departments of linguistic science. Much of the groping in linguistics is due to persistent dwelling by philologists upon written records to the detriment of vocal speech, and this notwithstanding later admissions that the only true speech is that of the people and not that of books.

Going back to the definition of a vowel, we note that the vowel originates in the larynx, a deeply interior organ of speech, where its general character is given it. This character is afterwards perfected and made sonorous in the mouth cavity and in the nasal cavities. A vowel, then, is a deeply interior sound and thus finely representative of man's love which Swedenborg tells us is the inmost of the man himself, his very life. Then again, a vowel is breath from the lungs; breath which vibrates into sound. Here again we are shown how it is born of the very life of man, his spirit or breath ultimated into significant symbols. Above all, its main function is to harmonize and unify discourse, for its most important characteristic is fluidity and musical quality, since, as we have seen, each vowel is not merely a note or single sound, but *one* holding in itself a series of harmonies formed about a basic central note.

An important characteristic of Hebrew speech is its use of

breathings. Some of these breathings are so heavy and pronounced that they are readily transformed into gutteral sounds. Breathings are just as important a division of sound values as are vowels and consonants, yet they have been most imperfectly studied; indeed, almost ignored by language science. In fact, breath, breathings, and vowel sounds (which are vocalized breath) are not only the fundamentals but the major part of speech, since the contact sounds are just the making audible by the help of voice of the movements or contracts of the vocal parts. They are, as it were, vocal gestures made by the tongue and other parts of the vocal organs while under the control of the thoughts. A very suggestive book by Miss D. D. Jones, "The Technique of Speech," (1919), written for the instruction of singers, emphasizes the controlling influence of the vowels in speech. The writer tells of a certain child she knew, who, up to the age of five, never spoke a word, but always made use of a musical tone language of her own contriving, and managed it so cleverly that she made all her needs and desires very plain to her associates. This approaches very near to Swedenborg's description of the speech of certain spirits. However, as to breathings, all that interests us here is the fact hinted at above, that they are a fertile source of sound change—hardening or softening sounds, shifting them into other areas of sounds, shunting vowels into consonants, obscuring, or even, in some cases, eliminating a sound altogether. Our dictionaries, and especially the Hebrew Lexicon, yield us many interesting examples of such changes and show us, as well, the gradual shifting of significations attaching to the changes. Irish, which is now again becoming a national speech, affords us valuable insight into such changes effected by breathings—the broadening or thinning of vowels, and the aspirations and eclipses of contact sounds, also, from similar causes, the shifting of both vowel and consonant sounds into others.

Most of these changes in speech values are, alas, in the

direction of debasement not only of the sounds but even more in the meanings attaching to them. This all too human tendency has often been pointed out, and Swedenborg tells us that there has been a tremendous deterioration of our earthly speech since the days of the Most Ancient Church. At the end of that dispensation the will and the understanding in man was no longer one but became separated, and from that time on there has been deterioration which most naturally has shown itself clearly in language. Swedenborg's Arcana Cœlestia Index under the hearings *Language* and *Thought* gives us references to this downward tendency in language. From all this we can readily understand how and why vowel tones often came to be hardened into other sounds, even into the extreme harsh gutterals, why they lost their continuous harmony and their musical quality and degenerated into blurred sounds and noises, and how they even came to drop out of some words altogether. This is, among many others, a striking illustration that devolution as well as evolution is and has ever been with us on earth.

It is curious to note that there has been a tendency, especially in the United States, to restore and clarify sounds in many words. The sounds of our words are much clearer in this country than, among the educated classes even, in England. This change for the better, though slight, is due to the American spelling book and the fact that we know so many words through the printed page alone. This change makes for clearness in speech, to be sure, but it does not restore to the vowel its full value as an emotion-bearer. An examination of phonograph records does add, however, an unexpected importance to vowel sounds. These records, when their indentations are magnified and plotted on paper, show that by far the most characteristic and prominent markings are all vowel tracings. These are all strongly waved curvatures of various patterns, while the consonant tracings are much less pronounced, each one of them, indeed, approaching to a straight line. Moreover, the consonant sounds in these records very materially affect the shapes

of the vowel curves. These curves, though still keeping their general character, differ slightly for each syllabic combination. Here, then, we have ocular proof that the vowel is truly the soul of the word, yes and the heart of each single syllable. Still another indication of this is the fact that slightly deaf people catch vowel sounds much more quickly than they do consonants.

So we find that our earthly speech is widely different from the heavenly one even in the one external respect, vowels, in which it somewhat nears the speech of spirits. And yet it does exhibit the very life of man in each of its syllables, showing forth in some shape, however covered, disguised, or degraded it may be, for it alone bears upon its tones all the inflections and vocal gestures that voice is capable of conveying, so that no matter how hard one may try, he is never able utterly to disguise his real self, since in some way or other his speech betrayeth him.

J. T. Halleborg.

THE NEW-CHURCHMAN'S ATTITUDE TOWARD EVOLUTION.

By the Rev. Harold S. Conant.

IN the ebb and flow of opinion concerning the validity of the doctrine of evolution, the New-Churchman should ask himself where he stands. Having the same reverence for facts that the scientist has, he should feel free, nay bound, to read those facts in the light of the New Dispensation. Certainly no New-Churchman will argue that as a Church we have no light on the meaning of natural facts. The doctrines of creation, of correspondence, of ultimates, and of degrees, to mention only a few, are all plainly involved. What we should by no means do is to suppress the Church's teaching on these matters and then proceed to accept as incontrovertible the interpretation put upon the facts in the name of science.

This is not, as has been asserted lately in certain New-Church quarters, to engender or continue a strife between religion and science. So far is this from being true, that we cannot be thankful enough to science for the wealth of facts that she has presented and will continue to present for the world's consideration. As proponents of a complete religion we need to be first of all lovers of fact. Nor need we quarrel with science because she has her theories to explain the facts. They are part of her working equipment, and have often proved serviceable in discovering new facts. The time comes, in the history of every scientific theory, when new facts compel its revision; but science very properly holds on to the old theory until a better one is presented,—one which better explains the facts.

Religion may never hope to impose its theories upon science; but if there should ever be presented to the world

in the name of religion a perfect explanation of all the facts of the universe, there is no reason to suppose that science would not welcome it as much as, if not more than, the world at large would.

If the New-Churchman honestly believes that the writings of Emanuel Swedenborg contain the basic principles needed for a complete view of life, then it is his job to apply those principles and to set forth in the light of them all the facts which science has collected.

The validity of the theory of evolution has been called in question by many persons during the time of its existence. Has the New Church anything better to offer to the world or to science as a theory of biological progress?

What might be called an invitation to the New Church from the men of science is contained in the following quotation from a recent speech by George McCready Price, Professor of Geology at Pacific Union College, California:

> If some one thinks that man must have started out on this earth in a splendidly developed condition from the very beginning, and if he points to the specimens from Cro-magnon as being just as old as any human fossils hitherto discovered [the Cro-magnon skull being splendidly developed], I do not know of any real scientific facts which can be produced against his view.

In other words, although science has a theory that man is an evolution from pre-ape-like stock, the facts equally well allow the theory that he is not. Another testimonial from science, similar in its trend, is the recent utterance of Dr. Herbert V. Neal, head of the department of biology at Tufts College, who stated that modern man, with his present brain and physique, has been on the earth for half a million years, and existed contemporaneously with the Neanderthal and Java types, hitherto supposed to have been his ancestors.

With such encouragement, it certainly behooves us to look at the matter afresh. Shall we not then, after agreeing on a definition of the theory of evolution, proceed to examine carefully the main arguments on which it rests, and if these are found to be at all weak, attempt to present a

different view equally consistent with the facts, but if possible more adequate?

By the theory of evolution we understand the theory that the more complex forms of plant and animal life have arisen from simpler forms.

Now, any rival theory would have to deny this, and would be strong in proportion to the cogency of the reasons given why the forms were separately created.

Since any theory, to be tenable, must, as has already been intimated, take into account all the facts, to these we may now turn, especially to those facts which seem to preclude the thought of separate creation, and *per contra* to some which look away from the theory of evolution.

Let us turn to the geologic record in the first place. It has in some quarters been thought to have been demonstrated that more and more complex forms made their appearance on the earth at successively later times. Even though this may be a fact, it does not prove transition. It simply shows that in the beginning life was of a simple form, and by some method not disclosed by the record, became more complex.

Further light on the matter is thought to be thrown by the discovery of fossil forms that stand as intermediates between distinct families, which are thus connected. The only thing that is really proved, however, by this discovery, outside the fact that certain forms flourish and become extinct, is that there is a closer contexture among animal forms than had hitherto been supposed. Birds and reptiles, for example, are so closely related that in the past animals have lived whose classification as bird or as reptile would be a matter of uncertainty.

A third point in palæontology is that fossils show a series of forms which indicate that a functioning part has gradually lost its function and persists in living forms as a vestige. An example of this is the "three-toed horse," with the two outside toes withering away to the splints on either side of the toe of the modern horse. The argument from "vestiges" in itself would be far too slight a piece of evi-

dence upon which to base a general doctrine of evolution, particularly in view of the notorious fact that changes quite as profound as can be effected by artificial breeding. Should it not rather direct our attention to the fact that Nature does allow changes, which are, however, strictly within the species, and bring confirmation to the thesis that no evolution from one species to another has taken place?

Turning now to the science of embryology, we find that many animals before birth pass through stages that strongly suggest adult forms lower down in the scale. For example, the human embryo passes through a fish-like stage. From this fact the generalization has been made that the development of the individual is a repetition in epitome of the development of the species to which it belongs. The transitions in embryo are thus held to reflect the transitions of the species in the past. Now no theory of life would be complete which did not take these transitions of the embryo into account, but if these could be explained without involving the idea of historic evolution, then the theory of evolution would not be the only possible theory of life. As to this idea of recapitulation, as it is called, the author of the article on Embryology in the last complete edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica" (the 11th), after reviewing most thoroughly the evidence says, "The view, then, that embryonic development is essentially a recapitulation of ancestral history must be given up." This judgment is reversed, to be sure, in the supplemental volumes just published, but on what seems to the writer to be insufficient evidence. Moreover in the later article the necessity of a truly comparative embryology based on a wide survey is strongly urged.

To discuss the embryological argument further requires that we remind ourselves of the New-Church teaching regarding living forms; and, accordingly at this point we shall begin to present the non-evolutionary theory of biological progress. The first point to remember is this: *The life history of an individual plant or animal, from germination or conception until death, together with every detail of*

its structure and use, is a perfect mirror of its spiritual counterpart which exists in heaven or hell. No one who is a New-Churchman can deny this. Few except New-Churchmen will admit it, because they are not convinced of this one-to-one relation between the two worlds. We must point out to the world how the acceptance of this not unreasonable assumption throws a flood of light on the whole cosmic process. It is the great truth that the world needs for its own orientation. It is a truth that the New-Churchman himself needs to ponder upon and understand.

The relation called correspondence is the key to creation. The marvelous variety and adaptation of Nature can give some faint inkling to mortal minds of the perfection of heaven and of the infinite variety of creative impulses now proceeding from the Supreme Ruler of the universe. Whether it be the study of the embryo, the larva, or the adult, it has its message to man.

For in collective man (God's image and likeness) the whole of creation—mineral, vegetable and animal, embryonic, larval and adult—is summed up. That is to say, in Nature, correspondentially viewed, may be found every attribute and phase of the life of man, good and bad. The noxious plants and dangerous animals are not merely emblems, but representatives and living images of the unlovely parts of man's character; and similarly the noble and beautiful forms are images of the comely parts.

We account for separate creations, embryonic resemblances, and extinct forms somewhat as follows. Spiritual progress in man is not a continuous process. Rather it consists in successive rejections of the bad and acceptances of the good. In its early stages it is embryonic; that is, surprising traces of low forms of thinking and willing are found, and inconsistencies abound until spiritual development has come to its re-birth. Even after this,—all the way along in fact,—grotesque caricatures of life have their day with us, and then happily become extinct. Finally, viewing the process as a whole we may say that the trend of these successive states is upward; and if one will tolerate

discrete steps in the advance, then in a sense there is an evolution in man's spirit.

The theory of separate creations is often termed old-fashioned, if not mediæval. It has been relegated to the heap of discarded notions at the instance of the law of parsimony, which asserts that among several explanations the simplest is to be preferred.

It might, to be sure, at first sight seem simpler to account for a single initial form of life, and to invoke a simple set of principles accounting for a transition of one form of life into another, than to assume separate origins for the different forms with no wide changes in any of them. This would be true, however, only if the actual transitions were observable, since as to the other point it seems clear that, if the law whereby the first form of life came into being acted once, it could and probably would, act more than once.

As to accounting for the initial form, and for the transitions in form, the following extract from the "Britannica" on palæontology is significant:

> The net result of palæontological observation is not favorable to the essentially Darwinian view that the adaptive arises out of the fortuitous by selection, but is rather favorable to the hypothesis of the existence of some quite unknown intrinsic law of life which we are at present totally unable to comprehend or even conceive. We have shown that the direct observation of the origin of new characters in palæontology brings them within that domain of natural law and order to which the evolution of the physical universe conforms. The nature of this law, which, upon the whole appears to be purposive and teleological in its operations, is altogether a mystery which may or may not be illumined by future research.

In other words, the origin of life has thus far resisted any simple explanation; and not less so have the transitions of forms postulated by science.

Moreover, to find forms in actual transition has proved practically impossible. Within historic time animal and plant forms have varied about the same fixed points. As the writer first quoted said of man, so might he have said

of grains of wheat or any other natural object the form of which has come down to us:

> If some one thinks that man must have started out on this earth in a splendidly developed condition from the very beginning. . . . I do not know of any real scientific facts which can be produced against his view.

The New-Churchman would therefore seem to be free to choose that theory which carries him to the highest ground. Since he knows that natural forms are the mirror-images of spiritual forms, the latter standing back of the former as creative agent and the thing created, if he chooses the theory of separate creations, then he will reason somewhat as follows: In the beginning God may have projected into existence comparatively few of the many possibilities, and those the simplest. As time went on and His purposes ripened, a larger and larger number of His manifestations of goodness and truth made their appearance. These latter forms had existed potentially in Him in all their perfection from the beginning, but had been delayed until the proper antecedent environment had been created. It was the same creative impulse, of universal action and scope, that brought these complex forms into being as brought the simpler. It is the same impulse which could and perhaps does bring new forms into being today; at all events it is the impulse which makes true the dictum, "Propagation is perpetual creation." As for Nature's unlovely forms, we have only to reflect that with the organization of hell, man having previously been created and having misused his freedom, a new avenue of creative influx was established, characterized by an inversion of the Divine impulse and resulting in poisonous and harmful forms.

Taking the assumption that the first created substances were incandescent vapors, we are bound to believe that there was a pre-existing medium in which these vapors could exist. The creation of this primordial substance which should forever serve as a plane of *cosmic projection*, was the first of an ever-continuing series of creative impulses

which looked to the successively more complete expression of the Divine Love and Wisdom.

The desire to create at all sprang from the desire on the part of the Divine Being for a reaction of love from without. This could be secured by the creation of a living soul in an environment where that soul should be in freedom. This entailed the preparation of the environment first. The living soul would be God's image and likeness in "simultaneous order," but the environment would be His image and likeness in "successive order." (God could not create anything that was not His image and likeness in some order.) The most elemental aspects of the Divine would first be created, followed by the more and more highly special forms.

And finally, the part that correspondence plays in the matter. When Swedenborg says that the natural world is the mirror of the spiritual world, he is stating a fact with more exactness than has been generally supposed. If I hold my right hand before a mirror and compare its mirror-image with the naked eye view of my left hand, I find the two practically identical. Not so when I look at both hands without the aid of mirror. They are so different that were I asked to alter a detailed pencil drawing of my left hand to make it a drawing of my right hand, I should have to change every line of the drawing without a single exception. And yet there is an almost perfect correspondence between the two hands, as I note when I rotate one hand and superimpose it on the other. This is a perfect illustration, as far as the comparison of two objects on the natural plane can be (and of course we are obliged to draw our illustrations from the natural world) of the relationship between the real substances of the spiritual world, known to the angels as forms of love and wisdom, and the corresponding though basically different substances of the material universe. These last are the mirror-images of the first. The process of creation begins with the Divine wish to embody a spiritual quality. It can be done only by a kind of *vortical projection*, of which an object and its

mirror-image offers a simile. These projections can take place only in a certain definite order, a given form being produced when the suitable conditions are present, and not until then: *e. g.*, at early stages of the earth's history when water and mud were the only conditions present, only certain very low forms of plant and animal life were possible, and then they were created; as the conditions grew more favorable for higher forms, they were created. The fact of creation is no more and no less intelligible in the earlier cases than in the later.

Thus is revealed to the New-Churchman, viewing all the facts, the hitherto "unknown intrinsic law of life," and that "purposive and teleological law" hitherto "altogether a mystery," the expression on an external plane of the spiritual realities resident in the Divine from the beginning; in short, creation by correspondence.

The theory of evolution, therefore, is seen to fail on two principal counts: it fails to account for the existence of such a world as exists; and it gives a relationship among facts which is found not to be true. The theory of creation by correspondence, on the other hand, does account for the existence of the world in all its particulars, and states the exact nature of the relationship among those particulars.

H. S. CONANT.

THE MARCH OF BIBLE CRITICISM

By the Rev. Jacob Emanuel Werren

IT used to stir up a fighting mood when a peaceful citizen got a volume in hand where a thoroughly up-to-date student aired his latest conclusions on biblical lore. The fighting mood came on when shrewd guesses of what the discovery of some new "find" might contribute to the demolition of the old-fashioned "bibliolatry" seemed like an unpardonable attack upon a solemn creed. "Bible and Spade"* is nothing less than up-to-date, the work of a modern scholar. But instead of a fighting mood, it arouses an attentive ear, and fills it with interesting facts. There is in it perhaps but little that is new to one grown grey in the work of Bible knowledge in the more scientific sense. But the volume does not claim to be put forth for specialists. It is the collection of six lectures delivered before the students of Lake Forest University, Ill., in 1921, under the name of "Bross Lectures." The fund was established by the late William Bross, Lieutenant-Governor of Illinois from 1868 to 1870. The object of the donor was:

> To call out the best efforts of the highest talent and the ripest scholarship of the world to illustrate from Science, as from any department of Knowledge, and demonstrate the divine origin and the authority of the Christian Scriptures; and, further, to show how both science and revelation coincide and prove the existence, the providence, or any or all the attributes of the only living and true God.

The task before Rev. Dr. Peters was a large and important one, and many might feel it a task implying at once

**Bible and Spade.* By Rev. John P. Peters, Ph.D., Sc.D., D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922. 239 pp., 12 mo. Cloth, $1.75.

a standpoint prejudicial to that of the donor of the fund. But to offset that idea let us hear something about him. Dr. Peters is a Protestant Episcopal minister. He was born in New York city in 1852, and was ordained into the priesthood after several years of post-graduate studies at German universities. As professor of Old Testament languages and literature he served seven years in the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia, and eight years as professor of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania. With the year 1888 he entered the practical field as director of the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania to Babylonia, and in this capacity conducted important excavations at Nippur. Since that date he has made numerous trips to Bible lands, and seems thoroughly familiar with the physical configuration of the countries, and well versed in the whole range of literature. He has been editor of a number of periodicals, and a prolific author. Among the works to his credit we find "Scriptures, Hebrew and Christian," 2 vols.; "The Bible as Literature," "Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates," 2 vols.; "Some Points in the Necropolis of Marissa," etc.

In the volume before us Dr. Peters speaks as an authority. The scope of the lectures may appear from their titles: The Ancestry of the Hebrews; Cosmogony and Folk-lore; History and Prophecy; Hebrew Psalmody; The Exploration of Palestine; and New Testament Times. In the volume the status of the Bible text, its history, its fitting into the picture presented through excavations, are happily mingled in mutual support, the whole being unfolded in scholarly simplicity. The author's attitude toward the advanced insight into biblical learning may be gleaned from his introduction to the "Hebrew Psalmody," from which we quote as follows:

> Recent New Testament criticism has tended, on the whole, strongly toward conservatism, the restoration of the old traditions of the authorship of the Gospels and of the Epistles of Saint Paul. These receive an early date in the latest literature on the New Testament. Its method of treatment of the text also tends to be

scientific and careful, demanding objective evidence before making changes, refusing to yield to the fascinations of subjective speculation. The tendency of recent Old Testament criticism has seemed to be rather opposite. There are, it is true, a number of voices raised in protest against the methods of the latter-day school of critics, but these, so far at least as sound is concerned, still seem to be in the majority. Their tendency is to divide up every book into as many fragments as possible, to reject all traditions as worthless, and to substitute for them speculations of their own. Their treatment of the text is the treatment of subjective speculation. This one emends the text because he thinks that, at the day at which he supposes the words were written, the writer must have said something quite different; or because it does not correspond with his idea of proper outward form. If it is poetry, he knows the methods of Hebrew poetry, which he has evolved out of his own brain and study, and he makes the Hebrew text fit his theory. Now this is, of course, a natural reaction against the extreme literalism of former ages. They accepted the evidence of any sort of tradition without investigation, and their treatment of the Hebrew Masoretic text was that God had made his angels write the book in heaven and had personally seen to it that every dot and point was put in its proper place. The one extreme is as bad as the other. We used to be taught the dogma of an infallible text, and sacrosanct tradition to be accepted literally, and now we are in the reaction which resulted from that extreme.

. . . . . I think the limit was reached by the late Professor Cheyne of Oxford, a most lovable, sweet, Christian soul, a most distinguished scholar, whose mind was so acute and original that he would not be content with anything on earth, and invented new places for himself. His early work on the Psalms was good, but in his last book his translations are absolutely unidentifiable with the Psalms as we know them in English or as I know them in Hebrew. . . . . .

Other recent commentators do not, however, stand so far behind. Professor Briggs, who did such notable work for Biblical Scholarship in other fields, in his commentary in the International Series, changed the text of practically every Psalm in the Psalter . . . . . partly because he had evolved a scheme of Hebrew poetry with which the Psalms did not agree. Like a schoolmaster correcting the exercises of his pupils, he calls up each Psalm in turn and corrects its poetry, not only excising words which will not fit into his scheme of measure, but mercilessly cutting off whole verses, or transposing their members, thus producing a machine-like evenness which will scarcely appeal to those who have loved the Psalms for their quaint or varied rhythm. He has made the

text conform to the exigencies of his metrical system. Kent of Yale, who has put forth so many books which are so abundantly used in schools and colleges, has followed Briggs in some of the most objectionable features of his commentary in his book of "Songs, Hymns, and Prayers of the Old Testament." (Pp. 132-135.)

Let it not be imagined that the volume before us aims at general accusation of scholars. It is not a carping outburst, for the author has a warm and generous appreciation for a host of co-workers, among whom are found such modern names as Jastrow, Prof. Thayer, Dr. Selah Merrill, Architect Schick, Prof. Edward Robinson of Union Seminary, Flinders Petrie, Bliss, and others.

The first lecture deals with the early condition of Bible lands, based largely upon the "first volume of Genesis," "a treasure-house of ancient lore." The chapter is one of the most attractive in the book, mainly because it sticks most closely to the text. That is to say, the treatment begins with the state of the original Hebrew, where the ancient division leads to a literary dissection that shows how much knowledge may be hidden from modern readers because they do not take the pains to penetrate the manner of original thought. Indeed, the whole chapter is, as it were, an exhibit of the simple appreciation of a modern mind in dealing with the records of the past. The result is the discovery of great worth in the ancient records as they are. The lecture is an interesting survey of historical study in general, showing from the earliest chapters in Genesis, how they report history indeed, but on a much larger scale than the cramped literal interpretation that long hindered progress in biblical intelligence. Discussing a vast number of points, the author comes to this conclusion about the origin of the Hebrew (and this is the center of the chapter):

Hebrew tradition [as represented by those early ones concerned with the location of Eden, the resting place of the Ark, and the home of Noah] points to the region which we now know as Armenia, by the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates . . . . .

as the homeland of Israel's first ancestors, and it also points to an Aramaean origin of the Hebrew [language]. (p. HH.)

But the author immediately shifts the ground of this origin in a footnote on their language: "However, they did not speak Aramaean, but Amorite, a dialect identical with that of the Canaanites and close of kin to Phenician." They seemed to take to the Canaanites because they were a people "vastly more advanced in civilization and culture." Later they "dropped [the Canaanite language that had] become their native tongue . . . reverting to Aramaean."

We see the author grope around for ethmic and linguistic origins, neither of which are shown clearly to agree, and we are really left about where the "old story" had been left in their own inquiry about their origin:

> Joshua said unto all the people, Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Naher. (Josh. p. 4:2.)

They appear out of a field whence issues a large influence that still awaits a keen eye of inspection.

In the second lecture, the hearers are treated to an exposition of the great panorama of the flood, Eden and the temptation, antediluvian heroes, the tower of Babel, Abraham and Amraphel, the laws of the Mosaic period. These ancient fragments of cosmogony, human psychology, history and ethnological development coming in contact with modern views of science and evolution led to a battle of centuries where the sharpest human intellect assumably religious strove with all its might against an equally persistent assumed truthfulness of science. The anxious ecclesiastic view was filled with zeal to "defend the Bible." The intrepid scientists stood for the proof that the Bible was itself not an original document, but an intermediate literature which demonstrated that the Hebrew book was an effort in its way to improve upon more ancient views. Says the lecturer:

We shall not, however, get the best results until we stop talking or thinking about defending the Bible, and devote ourselves wholly and unreservedly and without any *arrière pensée,* in Bible study as all other study, to the search after truth for truth's sake. I am not concerned in these lectures to support the Bible record by the results of archaeological research, I am concerned to find points where the written documents of the Mible and the archaeological discoveries throw light one upon the other, either giving us two witnesses to a fact, or the one explaining the other.

It must be conceded that there exists a stream of facts, come to view through excavations and sundry means, that point to duplication of the biblical themes of ancient importance. How the author explains the one by the other appears, for example, in what follows:

The history of the origin and development of the Cosmogony of Gen. I seems, then, to have been as follows: The early Sumerian peoples of southern Babylonia developed in their different centres story-hymns of the creation of the world, colored by the local and climatic conditions of their land and their religion, of which those of Nippur and Eridu were most important. Semitic peoples, pouring down from north and west, adopted the Sumerian myths and religion, including their cosmogonies, adapting them to their own religion, combining Semitic elements with Sumerian [a similar adaptation having first been made Babylonian]. . . . This cosmogony of Babylon became the cosmogony of the west land, i. e. of Syria and Palestine. This the Hebrews, of kindred stock, adopted, as they adopted the language of the country, adapting it to their religion; and as that religion became more and more spiritual, unfolding finally after the exile into a complete and exalted monotheism, this cosmogony (viz. as narrated in Genesis) was developed out of its grossness, its crudity, and its low polytheism into that magnificent picture with which the Bible opens, of one spiritual God, creating the world by his word. (Pp. 65, 66.)

Astonished himself over the exalted results from such low origin the author continues:

It is wonderful how out of the puerile, gross fancies of the primitive times, those which appear in the myths and legends of kindred peoples, the Hebrew thinkers developed so sane, so lofty, so spiritual a system of cosmogony and of theology. This is the glory of the Bible. I love to hunt out the ancient sources, to trace them down to see what they are, and then, as it were, to discern

the Spirit of God moving in them, for it was out of gross sensuality that a beautiful spirituality developed; out of crude materialism or the crassest anthropomorphism a lofty ethical monotheism. It is as when one sees God's power working in natural life: out of the vile ardure of some bog bringing forth a plant whose flower is the most graceful, ethereal, spiritual thing that you will find in all nature. (P. 66.)

This attitude of the author towards the development of the Hebrew literature is slightly, if at all, modified in his view of the Code "Hammurapi" (usually spelled "Hammurabi"), which he somewhat in detail compares with the Ten Commandments, and the Mosaic Law generally. He says:

These laws of Hammurapi are frequently represented as the original of the Hebrew laws, as at least of that earliest code of Hebrew laws which we find in Exodus 20-25. . . There is a certain relationship between the laws of Hammurapi and the laws of the Hebrew codes . . . ; but that connection is an indirect one. It is not a case of borrowing from the laws of Hammurapi, but a case of the possession and inheritance of a civilization and of ideas and constitutions similar in their fundamentals to the civilization and the cult of Babylonia. (Pp. 81 and 92.)

These few quotations sufficiently disclose the author's idea, how the crude primitive folk-stories, picked up here and there by the immigrant Hebrews, were worked over until in the Hebrew literature there blossoms out the fragrant beauty which—we might add—has lain hid until the modern critical, and so-called scientific, inquiry brought it to light—a point on which we wish to enlarge somewhat further on.

The third lecture is occupied with the biblical period of the prophets. Language comes to be an increasingly important factor, because the Hebrews develop their own Script, beginning with the Phenicians. Preparations are seen in David's time. In connection with this subject Dr. Peters launches a new development of the name IHVH from *Yahu* the God of Juda, or Hebrew *Yahudah,* the country of the God *Yahu,* or *Yah.*

David would build a home for the ark. The accomplishment was left to Solomon, who built the temple. With the

temple building gradually grew up the development of worship with a permanent temple service, vested in the Levites.

It is not to be wondered at that the Judaic development is seen as one in all the deistic movements, to each of which a "liberal spirit" is expected to grant its right to exist. Applying this freedom to the Baal worship, then remembering Jehu, "the follower of the prophets Elijah and Elisha in the most fanatical way," how "he undertook to blot out foreign worship in Israel altogether by a combination of cruelty with treachery," as "under pretense of a great feast, he got together all the priests of Baal and massacred them" (p. 108)—one is not altogether unprepared to hear a tear dropped for unfortunate Jezebel, and the question asked, "I wonder how we should have felt about it?" (*Ibid.*)

Considerable space is devoted to dates in the books of Jeremiah and Daniel. Any reader of history would know that in the latter, Nebuchardnezzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus, are considerably outside of historical order. The author asks therefore, "What then is the meaning of the statements in the book of Daniel? Are they pure fabrications"? (p. 126.) He answers himself, saying that while books like Jeremiah and Daniel are history—

> They are history of a different sort from that recorded in Woodrow Wilson's History of the United States . . . but if you will use it for what it was intended to be used for and what it should be used for, you will find that our new knowledge has made it a new and vastly greater book. (P. 130). . . Wisely did the great writer [of the book of Daniel], whatever his name may be we know not, combine the old folk stories, in the folk tongue [Aramean], with the glorious spiritual meaning put into them, with the new version, written in the sacred language of his people [Hebrew], the beginning of that apocalyptic, or vision of the future, which in the Bible ends with the Revelation of Saint John the Divine. Daniel is a grand book! (P. 131.)

"Hebrew Psalmody" (Lecture IV) is like Chapter I, one of the most interesting, because it sticks more closely to the original text. But for this reason it is also less intelligible to the general reader, who cannot be expected to follow dis-

cussions that pertain to the Hebrew language. While all the lectures are written in plain English type, in order to see the pertinency of the argument, one needs really a smattering of Assyro-Babylonian and Sumarian language, besides Hebrew and Aramean. It is not sufficient to see that the lecturer knows them, for he is not merely "talking," but demonstrating for a purpose; and that purpose may or may not be suitable for the individual hearer. Stress by one may emphasize, where another might counsel moderation.

The author criticises students of the Psalms because:

> These writers have failed to study and appropriate the great mass of ancient liturgies of a character and form very close to the Hebrew which have been unearthed in Babylonia in recent years, and which throw a perfect flood of light on the outward form, the ritual use, the thought and ideas of our Hebrew Psalter . . . one single instance of complete misunderstanding resulting from this: these modern critics have brought the Psalter down to a very, very late period.

The author adduces specimens from an Egyptian necropolis, from Sumerian musical directions, showing that the Hebrew Psalms share overlooked qualities with acknowledged ancient literatures, showing neither a Hebrew borrowing, nor Egyptian or Sumarian song on a par with the Hebrew.

> The Hebrew Psalms are by general consent the greatest hymn-books ever written. Their wonderful power and spirituality have affected generations . . . and will continue to be a power to uplift and comfort men's souls. (P. 149.)

One feels tempted to quote largely from such genuine estimation; but after a general appreciation of David and his time as real writers of Psalms, the book is mainly used to allow Dr. Peters' work in the field, and familiarity with the lands and their history, to tell the story. The valuation of the Psalms chiefly as liturgical directions is most clearly, one might almost say enthusiastically, brought out (pp. 161-167) while discussing Psalm 84.

> When I was struggling with this stanza [verses 5-8] in my room in a hotel in Jerusalem . . . it occurred to me to trans-

late it literally. . . Having translated it literally there in Jerusalem, it dawned on me for the first time, what it was that I had actually before my eyes, [viz.] rubrics directing where the sacrificial procession should go, and . . . I saw the whole thing before me.

And he had the greatest satisfaction in making "a distinguished scholar of Hebrew," the father Hugues Vincent of the Dominicans, and afterwards "many plainer scholars," see it as a processional Psalm, as clearly as he did himself. His translation of verses 5-7 would be as follows:

5. Blessed is the man whose strength is in thee [i. e. Jerusalem].
   Between them the bridge. [Robinson's arch remains.]
6. In the valley of weeping [i. e., the Tyropean valley,] by the fountain that was made [i. e., the Virgin fountain, Hezekiah's aqueduct.]
   The pool [i. e., the pool of Siloam] the leader encircleth.
7. From rampart to rampart they go.
   The God of gods is seen in Zion.

The fifth lecture, on the exploration of Palestine, is a review of what the investigation of that country has brought to light: The "finds" were at first purely accidental, even though recognized by eminent men. Such finds were the Moabite Stone, now in the Louvre, Paris, containing "the oldest inscription of any kind in the Phoenician alphabet," by King Mesha, about the middle of the ninth century before Christ. Another was "the so-called Siloam Stone." The discoveries are very interestingly told, spiced with the difficulties that foreign governments found in securing the treasures through the Turkish government, and securing their permanent preservation and accessibility. Men prominent in recognizing and securing the "stones" were such as Klein, Schick, Clermont-Ganneau, and others.

A different kind of discoveries was awakened by the work of Edward Robinson of Union Seminary, New York, Rev. Eli Smith, Lieutenant W. F. Lynch, U. S. N., who began the surveys of the Holy Land. The effort aroused interest which brought about the organization of the Palestine Exploration Fund, under which more scientific investigations

were managed. To it is due first of all the accurate survey of Palestine, accompanied by a "description of all archaeological remains of antiquity (sic.) above ground" (p. 171). The resulting relief map and accurate charts are well enough known as putting every Sunday school under perpetual obligation.

The survey became a great aid to a more modern exploration, which has not set out to despoil places and to traffic in "antiquities," but endeavor systematically to extract the history of a site by uncovering, layer by layer, the pages which time has written in the dust of decay. The old Jerusalem is buried under twenty to forty inches of debris. It will be a long time to uncover its geography which has been altered materially. Numberless interests, sacred and otherwise, prohibit excavations there. They can be carried on only where re-building operations permit. But systematic work has been done at Gezer, Ain Shems, Taanach and Megiddo, and in Samaria (the last by Harvard University).

When all is said, the lecturer feels moved to conclude:

> We have not heretofore found much of Hebrew remains. . . From what little we have yet found, it would seem . . . as though the Hebrews always stood far behind in material civilization. They were no builders. They left few records in the form of inscriptions. (P. 201.)

The "New Testament Times," forming the closing chapter, is a fit termination of the cycle of six lectures. It is refreshing to see how the very numerous papyri discovered and collated, have proved the language of the Gospels as the common speech of the day; that the Gospels are real documents, and the many "Sayings of Jesus" recorded by multitudes of hearers—about all of whom could read and write—give assurance to wavering minds how truly real a man Jesus was. But more, the multitudinous fragments not merely "corroborate" the Gospel stories, inasmuch as the Gospel report is incomparably superior to any of the scraps giving us the efforts of simple and sincere followers. The author proceeds:

> The discoveries in Palestine . . . and the discoveries in Egypt . . . have introduced a realism into the Gospel story which I felt most keenly on my last visit to the Holy Land. At Capernaum I could picture to myself, from what had been unearthed, the beautiful synagogue of stone . . . which had been built by the centurion, and of which the people of Caperaum were so proud. I now know where Capernaum really was, where Bethsaida was, where Gennesaret was. I see the scenes as I read. My mind, when I last visited those places, was no longer full of questionings and doubts, as formerly. I could give myself wholly to treading in the footsteps of Jesus.
>
> Comparison of what has been found with what has been handed down in the canonical Gospels will, I think, satisfy the ordinary reader that however interesting papyri-sayings and Gospels may be to the curious inquirers, our Gospels have skimmed the cream. (P. 232.)

The author is particularly successful in giving his testimony as an experienced archaeologist to the reliability of "the Gospel of John," as the report of an eye-witness:

> I speak as an archaeologist, to whom these objective things appeal with telling force because of my practical experience. . . And it seems to me clear that he who tells the story was present on that night. (Pp. 238 and 239.)

Thus ends the book, which all through is made alive with the personal touches of the author who has not merely read books about work done in discovering the real scenes of Bible times, but who has himself accomplished things that have made his name an honored addition to the long list of learned contributors to sacred lore.

While finding the book almost fascinatingly readable, one can scarcely understand its trend and position. The science of archaeology deals with the remains of human life in the surface of the habitable earth. It is the search for the state of the human soul in the remnants of dust and ashes that once were animated by real life. Whoever deals with the lifeless witnesses of a one-time organism enters indeed into a seeming chaos; but his duty is to disentangle what is chaotic, that the detached elements may be seen as reendowed with a soul animation. In the measure that in the

"dead remains" come to view orders and series of past stages of life, a little mound, if skilfully handled, may become the depositary of revelations in whose bosom is the life-tale of a city and its population from the beginning to the end of the growth of that tale. In other words, the tell or tumulus is a tangle of what once were forms of life, and in these forms of life the archaeologist restores in his mind the once real state of life. Through the accumulated remnant forms of life he constructs a series, a history of that life. The true archaeologist does not confine his eye to the single place he may be excavating; his experience is of use in neighboring fields, until the story repeats itself, and the science applies to the earth itself as the habitation of man. The archaeologist who, so to say, has learnt his science in Egypt, will be at home to apply it in Babylonia and in Palestine. So he builds up the life stories of his nations.

The interesting fact about these countries is, they have a parallel story that serves as a checking station for work done. Believe it or not, the sacred literature of the Hebrews has furnished that which has been the spice in the archaeology of these countries, and the cause of perennial reviews of the human life in it. The Hebrew sacred literature unfolds the development of that life, with an eternal interest, not in the dead past, but in the living present, and evidently with a view to assist it to be perfect. The perfect life is the life in harmony with the Divine Life. This is the *religious* life, that makes man a Church. The author rightly views the only possibility of a true church the man of a monotheistic religion.

The perennial question that rises in my soul, and will take form in words is, How can a man whose life work it is to follow the re-animation of organic moulds where once life was active come to the conclusion that "out of crude materialism or the crassest anthropomorphism a lofty ethical monotheism" developed.

It is wonderful, how out of puerile gross fancies of the primitive times, those which appear in the myths and legends of kindred

peoples, the Hebrew thinkers developed so sane, so lofty, so spiritual a system of cosmogony and theology. (P. 66.)

The author covers his wondering, not with archaeological sense, but with a pious phrase, "This is the glory of the Bible," (Ibid). And the supposed man of the church takes the blindfolded archaeologian to show him the scene that makes him confess.

I love to hunt out the ancient sources, to trace them down, to see what they are, and then, as it were, to discern the Spirit of God moving in them; for it was out of gross sensuality that a beautiful spirituality developed. (Ibid.)

In unrestrained satisfaction the archaeologist explains the process:

It is as when one sees God's power working in natural life, out of the vile ardure of some bog bringing forth a plant whose flower is the most graceful, ethereal, spiritual thing that you will find in all nature. (Ibid.)

Why does the scientific mind put out of sight the seed? From this seed comes the plant with its most graceful flower, and not from the ordure of some bog. Again, when he considers his own search for the soul in the remains of antiquity, he has not ordure or a morass, but forms of life and organization with which to deal. Even in ordure, the plant goes scientifically to work and seeks for remnants of organic substance in which to find support, while air and sunshine furnish the more immediate food for seed-life.

But let us come somewhat nearer to the question, Why does not the archaeologist go to the life as he finds it in reality, always beginning in the babe. Does he here find crude materialism and the grossest conceptions? Is not everything about infancy woven in sweetest innocence? Does not the mind come to consciousness in the most charming idealism? Is not youth the most perfect exhibition of aspiration? Is not manhood and maturity the crown of usefulness—if it has not marred its march of development by forsaking the ideal through descent into materialism, sensualism and godlessness? Is it not true in every line of

development that the beginning is a pure impulse (something within that impels), the universality lying in the dictum, "And God saw everything that He had made, and behold, it was very good." It is not ordure, not a miasmatic swamp, with which life begins; but it is ever endowed with perfection from which to start its own career in progression, or in retrogression. The philosopher's start is wrong, and he views life upside down by seeing it start from ordure, and not from a perfect seed.

For instance, Assyrians and Babylonians are not unrelated humanities out of ordure, but out of Sumir stock. If they are gross and coarse in their mental stature while the Semites are lofty, it is because Sumirs, Babylonians, and Assyrians are either degenerate specimens or atrophied in their development. The Semites, in their literary setting, are provided with the means of normal development.

It is, however, a gross mistake to view the Semites as a pure-minded, noble race. It is a mistake to see them gather their direction for development in the degeneracy of the Sumirs and their successors. Their literature is older than any other in the world, however they received it. Revelation is the name for it, whatever its source—and the continual reversal of this situation hides both the degeneration of the Sumirs and their descendants, as well as the true attitude of the Hebrews to their Revelation.

It is the false attitude of human thought that a man is self-developed which makes men see theology arise from crass materialism, or religion from sensuality. A child is not self-taught, but taught by intelligence; and the human race was ever taught by Intelligence. Revelation is the latest name of the Universal Intelligence. However, works like Dr. Peters' "Bible and Spade" are helping us to come one step nearer to the Book as Revelation.

A like false position in regard to the Hebrew language fails to give the light for which the world is waiting. Strange that Dr. Peters does not pursue his ray of light any further. He is one of the first to see in the Psalm-

period (David's day) the great linguistic change when Hebrew became alphabetic, that is phonetic, and provided the future of the race with one of the most powerful means for development. The Hebrew vowels were introduced when the language became alphabetic (masoretic text). But it is a mistake to say that before this masoretic writing "the Hebrew was written in consonants only" (footnote, p. 133). Before the alphabetic stage there were no *consonants,* and what appears written without vowels was not a purely consonant script. Before the alphabetic value, the signs had a representative sense, to which the *names* refer that belong to the Hebrew Script. It is not without meaning that the first letter in Hebrew alphabeticism is not *a,* but *Aleph,* meaning generally a *thousand,* but also "to teach," "doctrine and instruction," a "ship," to be "first." It has these meanings because in *Aleph* (being written in Hebrew by means of three signs) the idea is supported by the trine. But this belongs to an archaeology that has not yet been explored.

With the best intention of reading Dr. Peters' book sympathetically, we cannot help saying that the present interpretation of the facts of this interesting science presents the subject largely inverted. We are in an interesting expectant attitude at this moment when the great religious denominations are calling their adherents to the banners of "the fundamentals," or a creedless "liberalism." A book like Dr. Peters' lectures might serve a great use. Unfortunately the position taken from the beginning robs it of any real strength. The fundamental idea to which the Bible invariably leads is the personality of God. It is the question which disturbs both the "fundamentalists," and the "liberals." You read their definitions of what they mean by "God," or "the Divine," and you find that both parties are struggling to circumscribe an idea which is utterly beyond their grasp, and will be of greatest difficulty to themselves and to others, because there is no basis in human thought itself for grasping what confessedly is beyond it.

The only possible middle ground is some *common* authority, to which all can agree to resort. The world has struggled for thousands of years, but cannot be said to have found it.

Such a work as "Bible and Spade" would be expected to help to such an end. We began by being told "there is a Bible," and also "there is a Spade." In the end we ask, "What is the Bible?" and "What has the Spade contributed to it?" The old questions are still with us, and—the old world is still in doubt. We are sorry we cannot say to the literalist, "Here is something that will add light to your faith"; or to the liberal, "Here is something of value for you to consider."

JACOB EMANUEL WERREN.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

REFLECTIONS ON THE GREAT STRIKES OF 1922.

The great strikes of 1922, the coal strike and the railway shopmen's strike, affect everyone of us so intimately that it behooves everyone of us to give them most thoughtful attention and study to learn what may be our duty in the premises and what, if anything, we can do to hasten the time when peace may rest on industry.

The world war seemed the culmination of selfish nationalism, but the spirit which animated the nations in the war seems now to find expression within the borders of each nation, to say nothing of the actual wars which are still raging between nations. The great strikes are the direct expression of selfish antagonistic class interests. The industries in which these strikes have occurred are such basic, indispensable industries that the very life of our nation is threatened. The existence of our boasted civilization is at stake. Our social and economic organization is trembling from the assaults from within its confines. It is not unnatural to be pessimistic as to the outcome but if we can bring ourselves to a firm, effective belief in Divine Providence we will feel the urge to find under Divine Providence a real solution for the fearful problem which confronts us as individuals, as a nation, and as a church.

A review of history should prove enlightening. And first let us look at history as written in the rocks and the earth. The creative Love and Wisdom of the Lord coming down from the spiritual sun through the natural, created sun caused the marvelous growth of the carboniferous period when as the joint product of heat and abundant moisture the immense forms of vegetation covered the earth in the region in which

subsequent races of men were to find coal prepared for their use. This created substance, coal, may be regarded as the material basis for the wonderful advances which the human race has made in the last one hundred and fifty years. The Love and Wisdom of the Lord may almost be said to have been embedded in coal for countless ages for the benefit of the generations of men which have been born since the Last Judgment, which was accomplished in 1757. The mastery of the world has passed from the shores of the Mediterranean to the shores of the North Atlantic, and during the past century no material condition has contributed so much to this change as has the control of the coal supply. Our age has become absolutely dependent on coal for its very life, and the nation or corporation or individual which controls the coal controls this life. While we are in this world we depend upon material conditions for living our lives, and it is of the utmost importance that these conditions be favorable for growth naturally as well as spiritually. In the present age coal is the indirect means of supplying heat to the really virile races of mankind. Without coal the large part of our present machinery would be useless, so that our whole material progress depends on coal. England was the first country to make great advances through the possession of coal, but the United States has made great strides in recent years for the same reason. Coal was first discovered in America in 1750, anthracite in 1793. Is it not suggestive to us as New-Churchmen that these sources of power had their development in this land of freedom almost coincidently with the period of the Last Judgment and the inauguration of the Church of the New Jerusalem? But the conditions which confront the people of the United States in this year of grace, 1922, show the hollowness and inefficiency of private control of the God-given treasures of nature.

Twice the mine capacity necessary to supply the nation with fuel is in operation. Twice the number of men necessary to mine the useable supply of fuel are bound to the industry. No agency exists to adjust effectively the supply to the demand. Two hostile camps, employers and employees, contend

for supremacy, and no consideration is given to the welfare of the overwhelming majority of the people absolutely dependent on the co-operation of these warring factions. No theory of "enlightened selfishness" will give us the answer to this problem. Government control in the selfish interest of the great majority will not solve the problem. We must look to and work for the application of a higher motive than selfishness to release for the service of mankind this stored-up correspondent of love and good, this stored-up energy of the earth's luxuriant vegetative stage, this wonderfully convenient and effective fuel stored up in our coal mines.

Having traced the history of coal from prehistoric times, what can we say of the railroads? Surely railroads are the product of man's energy and ingenuity. There is no question of Divine Providence here. But, wait! Glance at a railroad map which does not feature the water-courses. Then superimpose a map showing the water-courses. The railroad map reveals the water-courses; and along the banks of rivers, through passes in the mountains, through valleys, along the edge of the ocean wind the rails which are as blood vessels, arteries and veins, to the body social and economic. The water-courses, the results of ages of erosion, have in the past century been bordered with iron and steel rails carrying the "iron horse" throughout the length and breadth of the land, ministering to the wants and needs of the people. The Divine Truth descending through the planes of heaven finds its expression in the results of the action of water, the correspondent of truth. The action of glaciers and glacial rivers in the Providence of the Lord has left us with channels in the patient earth through which the genius of man, sustained by the same Providence, lays his rails and brings the remotest sections of the land into close communication. But life can be abused as well as used; and selfish control has come to such a point that it has overreached itself, and in spite of all that Nature has done in providing ways of access to its riches, the man-made railroads cannot be operated for the service of mankind. Selfish profiteering, unwise management, grudging labor have combined to cut off the life blood of the nation;

and our government has been impotent in the face of the fearful contest.

The influx of good and truth is hindered, interrupted, impeded, nay almost checked and stopped, and we wonder whether we are approaching a cataclysm which will overwhelm our much vaunted civilization.

The remedy to which the government finally resorts is the injunction, a weapon of drastic possibilities, used to prevent irreparable damage. Its intention is to deter men from interfering with the freedom of others to work peaceably. It brings under the direct control of the court acts which, under ordinary circumstances, would not be considered criminal. Many people feel that it suspends the operation of the safeguards that have been developed to protect one charged with crime from unjust condemnation. The injunction has all the marks of an effective weapon. It may be dangerous if not handled wisely. It may react on the party using it. But it seems to have the psychological effect of causing men to hesitate to violate it much more than they hesitate to violate common law. Perhaps the uncertainty as to its application is a reason for the hesitancy to incur the penalties of violation, which may be fine and imprisonment.

Our common law is said to go back to the Ten Commandments as its foundation. Violation of the laws of God brings penalties corresponding to the extent of the violation. Violation of the laws of men brings penalties which must be determined by those whose duty it is to administer the laws. The Lord leaves men in freedom to do good or ill. This freedom the Lord preserves for man in the most marvelous ways. Society, however, cannot leave men in freedom to do good or ill. For its very preservation it must restrain as far as possible the doing of evil. Therefore the injunction seems justifiable.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the Lord came to the earth to preserve man from the danger of destruction by evil. It is only as a result of His overcoming the power of evil that the world is preserved. The need of the day is social regeneration in the direction of a voluntary conversion to the

thought of service, to the sense of obligation and responsibility resting on society for the good of its members. The church should have such a knowledge of the Lord and His ways that it can clearly present and expound the principles of right living. This knowledge is applicable not only to the individual but to society at large. Experience in applying the principles of right living will open the way to more profound knowledge. We really learn only by experience; so there is the everlasting round of learning by experience and of applying the knowledge gained from experience. No doubt great good will come from the experience of these great strikes. It is an encouragement to feel that our government is founded on the principle of service, as evidenced by the preamble to our constitution:

> In order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

We should support men and measures which will carry into effect these high principles and, in the immortal words of the Declaration of Independence, we should be prepared to take the solemn obligation:

> For the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

JOHN DABOLL.

SWEDENBORG AND THE SEXUALITY OF PLANTS.

THE readers of the REVIEW are having their attention sharply directed to Swedenborg's teachings about the nature of propagation and the correlative sexual functions in animals and plants. The article in the April number and the series of articles in this issue present some contrasting views and positions which suggest further discussion.

We are interested in considering more closely two aspects of the subject: the facts and principles involved in Sweden-

borg's statements; and the meaning of "sexuality of plants" in the current language of science. It seems, for our purpose, convenient to begin with the latter subject.

The term "sexuality" is applied for convenience and in a more or less figurative way to plants in order to mark certain correlations between plant and animal. The word sex applies directly and originally to men and women; then for convenience it is applied to animals in general, and finally extended to plants and even minerals (see Pliny 13, 4, 7, §31; *et in locis aliis*). In application to plants, the term has a well-defined and restricted use; we cannot say in general that plants are male and female, as of animals. Of some plants this can be said, for example of the class in which the stamens and pistils are located in different individuals; but in most flowering plants the pistils and stamens are on the same flower, and the word sex has no application to the plant as a whole, but only to the organs of reproduction. We do not mean, then, by "sexuality of plants" that plants are male and female, as animals are; but only that plants have organs of reproduction in some measure analogous to those of animals. Such considerations lead us to observe that the term "sexuality of plants" is vague and indeterminate; and the attempt to arrive at clearness and precision is attended with great confusion and complexity. The nearest approach to a definite statement that can be made about the sexuality of plants is applicable not to plants directly but to certain cells having a specific location in the body of the plant. In most cases the location involves an organ for producing the cells and a mechanism for bringing certain of them together. In all well developed animals, these organs, called the reproductive organs, are located in different individuals, but in most well developed plants, these reproductive organs are located in the same individual. We may say, then, in general, and with the needed qualifications, that plants have reproductive organs analogous in certain fundamental particulars to those of animals. In cases where the reproductive organs are located in different individuals, we may conveniently extend the analogy and speak of plants as male and female; but properly and strictly the

word sex has no direct reference to the plants themselves. In general, therefore, it is incorrect to say in the precise language of modern biology that plants have sex, that they are male and female.

But granting that plants have certain characters and functions analogous to those of animals and that this analogy justifies us in applying in a loose and conventional way the term "sexuality" to them, we may properly select among such characters and functions those which for our purpose we choose to emphasize as the basis of sex distinction. With this understanding, we may pass on to consider Swedenborg's use of terms in treating of the sexuality of plants, and we shall see that his use was fully justifiable on the basis of fact and of principle.

Swedenborg's position was that in strictness the distinction of sex was not properly applicable to the members of the vegetable kingdom, but in view of the facts of reproduction and growth it is convenient to characterize all plants as relatively male and the earth as relatively female. The facts are obvious; plants produce the seed; and the earth receives, nourishes, and brings forth the plant from the seed. In Swedenborg's own words (True Christian Religion, n. 585):

> In trees and in all other subjects of the vegetable kingdom, there are not two sexes, masculine and feminine, but every one of them is masculine; the earth alone, or the soil, is the common mother, thus the woman; for she receives the seeds of all plants, opens them, carries them as it were in the womb, nourishes them, gives birth to them, that is, brings them forth into day, and afterwards clothes and sustains them.

All these functions are named by their analogy with those of the human mother; and in accordance with these analogies the earth itself is called mother; the language is perfectly definite and true to fact. Indeed, the analogy is so obvious and so commonly recognized that we have the universally adopted figure of speech, "Mother Earth." It is true that Swedenborg was pushing the analogies beyond their usual scope into the realm of spirit; he saw in these correlative functions not mere analogy but "correspondence"; he was

setting forth the nature of "regeneration" in terms of generation, and he could do this properly by virtue of the "correspondence" between them. He analyzed the process of generation into two great stages: that of seed *production* and that of seed *development*. In his view, seed production is essentially a spiritual, not a mere natural fact and process. In the case of man, at least, seed production is a case of creation. "Man's seed is conceived interiorly in the Understanding, and is formed in the Will"; in the reproductive organs it is given a natural covering, transferred to the womb and thence to the light of day, as a fully developed infant. Here is the statement; we may treat it as unintelligible or false as we please, according to our capacities of understanding or belief; but we are bound to recognize it and make some disposition of it. The mere naturalist would by habit and principle ignore it altogether; but an open-minded and faithful reader would look for the truth of it. The general truth with which the intelligent reader would start is that no fundamental biological fact can be explained by mere physical detail; this is another way of saying that every biological fact of fundamental character is a complex of two processes: one natural, the other spiritual. With this general truth in mind, we may look for the meaning of Swedenborg's statement. The seed of man, as here understood, is, when it first takes form as a germ-cell, a highly organized body; it has a character and a constitution, it is a series and a form of order; in short, it is a well ordered system, embodying a plan, an idea, and capable of fulfilling an ideal. Now, the characters of order, plan, idea, ideal, are spiritual; they are mental, intellectual, rational, and purposive. The "seed" of man then is a spiritual product, the product of directive spiritual forces and activities; in other words, the product of spiritual heat and light. But spiritual heat and light are the universal forms of transmission of the Divine Love and Wisdom, and the human intellect is an organ for receiving, limiting, defining, as the will is the organ for giving effect to, the Divine Love and Wisdom. The intellect, then, is the agent by means of which the Divine Love and Wisdom operate to create the seed. It would be easy to

collect statements from the body of Swedenborg's works to cover all these points, but for the present purpose it is unnecessary, as they are more or less familiar to constant readers of his writings. With certain qualifications the same thing may be said of the creation of seeds in plants. What Swedenborg means, therefore, is that plants are seed forming organisms, and as such they perform a masculine function, and in reference to this fact they may very properly be called male. So far all is clear and true to fact.

But some over critical and narrowly partizan readers object that Swedenborg goes beyond these general statements, and categorically denies the view of the learned of his day, the scientific view of that day, that there are two sexes in trees and plants. This is not a fair interpretation of Swedenborg's language. He does say that among the learned it is taught that vegetation with plants corresponds to prolification with men; and this he does not deny. What he does deny, and very properly, is that this correspondence goes to the extent of involving two sexes in plants. He recognizes that this correspondence holds with respect to certain particulars of the process of fertilization, but he used the word "sex" in a wider and deeper sense, to cover more characters, than those involved in the mere process of reproduction; he included more of the life history of the plant, especially the development and growth of seed and plant; and so he took in the relation of the plant to the earth. Here he saw certain sex analogies which for his purpose were more important than the then obscure details of polination. This was the point of the issue between himself and some of the botanists of his day. He did not object to the sex analogies which were supposed to exist in the relations of stamen and pistil, but he declined to make them the basis of the whole meaning of sex. And Swedenborg was right in this; it is the fact of sex that makes the difference between the organs of reproduction; it is not the difference of the organs of reproduction that constitutes the fact of sex. It is true that modern investigation of reproduction has emphasized the facts of "fertilization," or the union of egg and sperm; the whole process has been

traced to the union of the sperm-nucleus with the egg-nucleus, and to the equal division of their "chromosomes." It is both curious and highly significant that male and female characters are observed in the mutual behavior of germ cells. It is on the basis of this difference of behavior that some cells are called male and others female; to this is added the further consideration that in very many cases one cell is known to be produced by an individual otherwise termed "male" and the other by an individual termed "female." Modern biology is characterized by the detailed investigation of the properties of cells; from this point of view all animals and plants are cells, either one or many; all organs and functions are traced to the nature and behavior of cells. It is not surprising, then, that certain features of the mutual behavior of cells should be taken as the basis for the distinction of sex, and that some cells should be called male, and some female. For certain purposes, this distinction between cells is valid and useful. But it may well be that so far as is known to present day science the distinction is deeper and wider than in reproduction; and that the mysterious behavior of chromatin is due more to the nature of the cell as a whole, to its constitution and activities, than to the independent functions of the chromosome bodies themselves. In fact this is just the problem of the last phases of modern investigation of cells. We must conclude, then, that from the point of view of natural history in spite of all the advances of biological investigation the distinction of sex remains a real mystery, and that Swedenborg's choice of sex characters, although obvious and more or less figurative, was at least as accurate and as significant as the choice of stamen-pistil relations or of egg-sperm relations. We should naturally and properly bear in mind that Swedenborg made his choice in view of the knowledge of his day; while botanists now make the choice in view of the very much more elaborate knowledge of plant anatomy and physiology. He could not fairly be expected to mean by sex what modern biologists mean by it, but this by no means implies that he used the word wrongly. It would be a moderate assertion, true to fact and to history, to say that Swedenborg

knew more about the meaning of sex than any other man who ever thought or wrote about it. This leads to some further considerations of fundamental importance.

The distinction of sex involves, as indicated above, the whole nature of the individual, and not merely the reproductive organs. It is true that Swedenborg did, in the statement about the sex of plants, select the seed producing function as the male characteristic, but he pushed this characteristic further back than the reproductive function. He had in view especially the seed producing function of the human male; sex in this case goes back to the psychophysical constitution of the individual, and becomes primarily a spiritual characteristic while remaining secondarily a physiological characteristic. The real nature and the full meaning of the male sex, then, lies distinctively, for mankind, at least, in the quality of the male intellect, and is referable to that original distinction in the constitution of the universe and, above all, in the contrast between the Divine Love and the Divine Wisdom. It is the distinct union of the Divine Love and Divine Wisdom in every creative act that constitutes the difference of sex. The distinguishable features of the male throughout the organic kingdom are derivable from the peculiar properties of wisdom, intellect, thought, reason; those of the female, from love, will, affection. Intellect and thought are aggressively active, enterprizing, penetrating, etc.; will and affection are receptive, expulsive, executive. These characteristics are impressed upon the entire psychophysical system, and inevitably upon the organs of reproduction and their product. Swedenborg's doctrine of sex is most completely developed in "Conjugial Love," and he should be read in the light of that doctrine.

The properties and behavior of the human germ-cell are for the naturalistic botanist matters of fact, mere observable details, of which no explanation is sought or attainable; although the scientific ideal contemplates systematic knowledge. Accordingly, when the botanist questions his naturalistic presuppositions, and as a truth seeker in the larger sense tries to comprehend the nature and behavior of the cell, he faces

a new order of facts, which are not mere sense data, physiological detail, but which nevertheless are precisely as definite and as observable as physical fact. For example, the cell has spontaneity; it has co-ordinated movements adapted to the pursuit and attainment of an end; it has an organic constitution fitted to work according to plan; its behavior is purposive in as much as it performs its function successfully; it is selectively re-active to stimuli; etc. Now all these are observable characteristics, but they are not sense data, physical facts; they are interpretations, if you please; intellectual objects and operations. In short, cells are psychophysical systems in which what we call matter and spirit are both concerned, and spirit is the directive force and the determinative agent.

Applying these considerations to the process of reproduction and sex distinction, we may say, with certain qualifications, that the male cell is the determinative spiritual agent; for throughout the organic kingdom except in the case of parthenogenesis, the female egg does not develop until impregnated by the active male germ. This is the statement in terms of modern biology. Swedenborg, of course, stated it otherwise, and from a larger and deeper point of view. When he said that the soul is from the father and the body from the mother, he is making the statement in a form which biology at its present stage is unable to interpret fully, for the reason that it has studied the cell as a mechanical, not as a psychophysical system. Aristotle makes the statement in very much the same form as Swedenborg, but in a very different context. For Aristotle, every body, every organic body, exists as such by virtue of an active principle, and so the active principle is the essence, the soul, of the body. He says, therefore, presumably on the basis of wide observation, that the male is the efficient agent, and gives the needed activity to the matter provided by the female. In short the body proceeds from the female and the vital principle, the soul, from the male. Both of these statements, Aristotle's and Swedenborg's, are beyond the province of mere naturalistic criticism, but they are not inconsistent with the most recently

discovered biological fact; on the other hand they are quite in agreement with such fact. The case, however, is very much more complicated for modern biology than it was for Swedenborg and Aristotle; there are certain details of the reproductive process which were unknown to both of them, and some of these details make it difficult to verify the truth of their statements. Beyond the commonly recognized fact that the female egg remains undeveloped unless impregnated by the male germ, we have the behavior of the chromosomes; these seem to divide and reunite on the basis of equal parts of male and female bodies, and it is this fact upon which the theory of hereditary is based, and upon which it may be asserted in biological terms that features and qualities, spiritual as well as bodily, are inherited from both parents. The fact of such inheritance is superficially so obvious as to be undeniable, but that by no means negatives the dicta of Swedenborg and Aristotle. The biological details of inheritance are too complicated and obscure to furnish a clearly defined denial of the assertion that the chief determinant in the process of reproduction is the property of the male. For consider the case of chromosomes: it is mere biological commonplace to observe that the mutual behavior of the male and female chromosomes is too complicated and obscure to yield any full and clear description. This is another way of saying that beyond a certain point no one knows what happens when the chromosomes divide and unite; and at this point the doctrine of heredity is in confusion and in progress. The latest stage of progress centers in the "Problem of Activation"; and the central feature of this problem is the fact or principle of "Fertilizin"; here we get back to Aristotle's "active principle," and to Swedenborg's "vital principle," or soul. Under these conditions it may well be that when the final truth is arrived at, we shall be able to say in clear light that in reproduction the male element dominates the process from beginning to end, and that the function of the female is to receive, to re-act upon, and to embody the "active principle" of the male. In other words, the male cell when it once appears in biological

history is thenceforward what Swedenborg and Aristotle would call the soul of the reproductive process.

In conclusion, we must say that our knowledge of Swedenborg's doctrine and of the problems involved in further biological investigations warn us against rash and confident dogmatism. The situation requires more patient and systematic study, more clear thinking, and more earnest devotion to the truth for its own sake.

Lewis F. Hite.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE TESTIMONY OF THREE SEERS.

THREE seers appear to have had visions of the influence of the Spirit of the Lord of Hosts through the imagery of two olive trees and candlesticks standing before the Lord of the whole earth. Their visions are described respectively in the fourth chapter of Zechariah, the eleventh chapter of the Revelation, and in the "True Christian Religion." The seers are Zechariah, John, and Swedenborg. Their testimony may be regarded as centering about the following text, which is in the midst of the account of Zechariah's vision as being the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel, the builder of the temple at Jerusalem, after the return of the Jews from captivity:

"Not by might, nor by power, by by my spirit, said the Lord of hosts."

Our study is to call attention to a remarkable series of thoughts which seems to be associated with this imagery of the two olive trees. There is an intimate connection between these symbols and testimony to the Spirit of the Lord, and we shall find that this connection is revealed by Swedenborg so that we can look back from what was revealed to him, examine these visions in the light of this revelation, and see the Spirit of the Lord revealed therein. Our study is necessarily brief and confessedly inadequate; but the suggestions are sufficiently pointed to indicate a line of investigation which should prove fruitful in learning the Way of Truth and Life which is the exhibition of the Spirit of the Lord.

The great need of the world today is not might, not power, not material things, but an appreciation, an adequate valuation, a clear understanding of the Spirit of the Lord. The two olive trees of the visions of Zechariah and John have a

correspondence or significance which make them the vehicle of the testimony or witness to the Spirit of the Lord and through them we shall make the effort to learn how the Spirit of the Lord is revealed. We shall not attempt to show that the three seers, Zechariah, John, and Swedenborg were represented by the two olive trees, but we hope to leave the impression that in some wonderful way these symbols were the means of bringing to men truths about the Lord's loving Providence for men. In doing this we shall avail ourselves of the testimony of the three seers, Zechariah, John, and Swedenborg. We shall glance at three churches in their beginnings, the Jewish Church in its renewed activities after the captivity, the Christian Church, the Church of the New Jerusalem. We shall see the world at three stages in its progress; in the sixth century before Christ, in the first century after Christ, in the eighteenth century after Christ. We shall learn of direct revelations at each of these three stages: revelations made possible by the Spirit of the Lord, revelations intimately associated with the symbol whose wonderful implications we would fain know—the two olive trees. We shall find that this symbol in its recurrence in history stands as does everything in the Word of God, not for temporal things, but for eternal things. We trust that the study of the testimony of the three seers will bring us to a clearer understanding of the Spirit of the Lord embodied in the Two Great Commandments of love to the Lord and love to the neighbor on which hang all the Law and the Prophets.

Let us turn first to the vision of Zechariah which was given in the sixth century before Christ, at the beginning of what is known to modern scholarship as the strictly Jewish Church as distinguished from the Hebrew Church. Incidentally it may be said that it was a time when true religion was at a very low ebb and the time was approaching when only the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ could save the world from destruction.

The Jews had returned from the Babylonish Captivity. They began to rebuild the temple which was to be the centre of such religious life as they had. There were delays and discourage-

ments. The prophets Haggai and Zechariah encouraged the Jews to complete the temple. In vision it is revealed to Zechariah that the Spirit of the Lord is with them in their work and he sets the vision before them in words which they can understand as applicable to the task which they have in hand. Joshua, the High Priest, and Zerubbabel, the Prince, are quite generally regarded by commentation as implied in the vision of the two olive trees as possibly some heavenly powers not so specifically named. With this assurance of divine aid, Zerubbabel, the Prince, completes the building of the temple. The promise that Zerubbabel, the Prince, shall complete the temple seems inextricably connected with subsequent promise to Joshua, the High Priest, who is crowned as the Branch. The story as drawn from Zechariah's testimony is complete as applied to the building of the temple but through it gleams the story of the Coming of the Lord and it is clear that the Branch is the symbol of the Lord. The two olive-branches, which are beside the golden spouts, that empty the golden oil out of themselves are truths from the Lord which when lived out in our lives bring acknowledgment and confession of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Jews from this vision expected an earthly prince coming with earthly might and power but in reality their prophets described a Divine Prince who should come to save the world, as in Isaiah:

"And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit. And the Spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah." (Isaiah 11, 1, 2.) And hundreds of years later Jesus, as He stood before Pilate, said, "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." (John 18, 37.)

The temple is destroyed, the Jews are scattered, but the testimony of Zechariah, the seer of the Jews is still vital to reveal the truth about the Lord. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

Contemporary with the vision of Zechariah was an event in a world movement which was destined to have a great and destructive influence in the history of the Jewish Church—the beginning of the Roman republic. Centuries later this predominant power conquered the Jews and destroyed Jerusalem thus apparently forever putting an end to the possibility of the Jews realizing their dream of world power.

We now turn to the testimony of the Christian seer. If we accept the conclusions of Bible commentators we will believe that in the first century of the Christian Church, the century when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, this conquering power was persecuting the devoted followers of the Lord. There were delays and discouragements. Again the need of the encouragement of the Spirit of the Lord of hosts was manifest and again a vision of encouragement was vouchsafed from heaven. To John in the Isle of Patmos came this encouraging vision of the powers of heaven arrayed against the powers of hell. And the victory of the Word of God in the spiritual world which the testimony of the Christian seer, John, revealed to the suffering Christians gave them courage to carry on. John saw the spirits of the old prophets battling and witnessing for the right and he saw them under almost the same symbols as had Zechariah: "These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks standing before the Lord of the earth." (Revelation 11, 4.) Although these witnesses fell in the contest with evil and in vision John saw their dead bodies lie in "the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also the Lord was crucified . . . after three days and a half the Spirit of life from God entered into them and they stood upon their feet." The powers of hell could not prevail against them, for the Lord was with them. Thus were the early Christians encouraged to look to the Lord for help. And the testimony of John, the Christian seer, brought comfort to his comrades, made them remain steadfast, couched in terms which appealed to them, which appeal to us, which will forever appeal to followers of the Lord, carrying as they do the message of the Lord through the old prophets. The words which

we find in another part of the Revelation seem appropriate also here: "These words are faithful and true: and the Lord, the God of the spirits of the prophets, sent his angel to show unto his servants the things which must shortly come to pass." (Revelation 22, 6.) "I Jesus have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things for the churches. I am the root and the offspring of David, the bright, the morning star. And the Spirit and the bride say, come. And he that heareth, let him say, come. And he that is athirst let him come: he that will, let him take the water of life freely." (Revelation 22, 16, 17.) The witnesses and the Branch are revealed in their glory as filled with the Spirit of Jehovah. Yea, the Branch is the Spirit of Jehovah, our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

"Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

Centuries roll by. The church which was nurtured in its simplicity by encouragement from heaven declines and yields to the blandishments of Rome. The Roman world becomes Christian in name. The secular empire of Rome falls but the spirit of *Rome* seems to energize the church organization instead of the Spirit of Jehovah. Even the Reformation fails to bring the church into vital relation with its Lord though it does give the Bible to the people and thus lay the foundation for more general knowledge of the Spirit of the Lord of host.

The time has come for a new church. Again the conditions are such that the nucleus of a church can be helped and encouraged, yes formed, by the testimony of a seer and in the eighteenth century "it pleased the Lord," Swedenborg says, "to manifest Himself to me and to send me to teach those things which will belong to His New Church, which is meant by 'the New Jerusalem' in the *Apocalypse*." (True Christian Religion, n. 851.)

Under the guidance of Divine Truth the two olive trees to Swedenborg are not simply the priest and the prince interested in the completion of the temple, not the spirits of the old prophets encouraging the early Christian Church in its struggles with Rome, but the Word of both Testaments in so far as they testify about the Lord (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 9548),

the good of love to the Lord and the good of charity towards the neighbor (*ibid.* n. 9780), yes, and also those who confess and acknowledge from the heart that the Lord is the God of heaven and earth and that His Human is Divine; and who are conjoined to Him by a life according to the commandments, for, says he, these two are the essentials of the New Church. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 490.)

And now we see what the Lord has been preparing for His creatures all through the ages so that they can be conjoined to Him through obedience to the commandments of His Word for thus only can the Spirit of the Lord of hosts enter His creatures. Love to the Lord and charity towards the neighbor are these two witnesses, these two olive trees. And it is only by the Lord's help that His followers can receive these loves. "But the Lord is our light and our salvation. Whom shall we fear?" (Psalm 27, 1.)

The testimony of Swedenborg, the seer of the New Church, makes it clear that we can now understand clearly the meanings that lie hidden in the language of the Word, that these symbols convey to us wonderful truths, as we, with the help of the Spirit of the Lord of hosts, put ourselves in the right relation to Him.

A most practical lesson comes to us in connection with the eleventh chapter of the Revelation which contains John's account of the two olive trees, the two witnesses. It came to Swedenborg, the seer of the New Church when he was explaining this very chapter. He seemed to go through the same experiences as the two witnesses described in the Revelation and then he heard from heaven that faith in the Lord and repentance are the two means of regeneration and salvation. These two achievements, regeneration and salvation, are possible only with the Spirit of the Lord of hosts.

What actual repentance is, Swedenborg tells us concisely, clearly, forcibly, as coming to him from heaven: "Actual repentance is to examine oneself, to hold oneself guilty, to confess sins before the Lord, to pray for help and power to resist them, and thus refrain from them and begin a new life; and all this you must do as if of yourselves. Do so once

or twice a year, when you come to the Holy Communion, and afterwards, whenever the sins of which you have found yourself guilty recur, say to yourselves, 'We will not do this because it is a sin against God'." (True Christian Religion, n. 567.)

When we do this our faith in the Lord will be strengthened. We shall better understand the meaning of the two olive-branches, which are beside the two golden spouts, that empty the golden oil out of themselves; for we shall return to the Lord the love which the Spirit of the Lord of hosts bestows on us and we shall also pass it on to our neighbor.

The testimony of the three seers is one. They all unite in showing us the intimate relation between this world and the other world; the loving interest which the Lord takes in His creatures, the wonders back of the symbols. They bring us to realize that the spiritual sense of the Word presents to us vistas of light and truth which it behooves us to explore for our very lives. Let us take to heart and try to follow the implications of the heavenly message: "Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

JOHN DABOLL.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

IT is inevitable that the drift away from the churches be followed by endeavor to confirm such movement and give freer play to the realization of its purposes.

Now as never before powers are organizing to remove restraints that have been placed about that day with the purpose of keeping it holy. It is the expressed desire to legalize forms of amusement, shows, theatres, games, and various forms of entertainment, and the lines of business essential to their promotion.

It is the immediate duty of the New Church to make most broadly known its knowledge of the true observance of the Sabbath. Not merely a part of the Word, but the whole of

it should be brought together for a true idea of the subject. "Search the Scriptures."

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," is the third Commandment, placed on the first table, because it enjoins duty to God, while the following ones refer to duty to man. It surpasses those which follow because it is primarily a "law of the spiritual life." Coming at the close of six days of labor, it stands for the "union of the Divine itself with the Divine Human in the Lord," its real tranquillity being in us the peace derived through our conjunction with Him. "Verily my sabbaths shall ye keep; it is a sign . . . that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth *sanctify you.*"

The Jewish Sabbath was a day of worship and rest from labor. Its observance is repeatedly and most emphatically enjoined. "Ye shall keep my Sabbaths, and remember my sanctuary" was among the first articles of the Covenant upon which the national prosperity was assured. If Israel turned aside seeking their own pleasure, then would come such desolation that the very land would "enjoy her Sabbaths."

Keeping the Sabbath is of wider concern than individual interest. "The nation that holds these injunctions [the Commandments] as Divine, and lives according to them, from religion, is saved" among the nations. As Paul said, the ceremonies of Jewish worship were a shadow of things to come. When the Lord came, He gathered all of the ceremonies of the purifications and feastings of the Jewish Church into Baptism and the Holy Supper. He also by word and deed changed the Sabbath of the Jews, which was observed with inactive rest, the "shadow" of spiritual tranquillity, into a day not only of rest but of action of specific kinds. The Old Testament enjoined keeping the Sabbath "in earing time and in harvest." When the Lord plucked the ears of corn for the hungry disciples, the Pharisees accused Him of breaking the law. His reply, "The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day," does not make harvesting and other labor Divinely lawful on that day. It teaches that the Sabbath is a time of humanitarian uses. So likewise of the various ministry upon that day. Nothing that the Lord did lessens the

obligation to "remember my sanctuary" in the public worship of God.

Public worship is absolutely essential to our nation and the world, for "without it man would know nothing of what is holy," and religion would pass away. Though "real worship is in uses"; "while in the world, man ought not to be otherwise than in external worship."

In the spiritual sense not to work on the Sabbath day is not to do anything from self-love, though every day is a Sabbath to him who is conjoined to the Lord, though the angels are in a perpetual Sabbath, on earth the sanctuary should be remembered. The reason why it is enjoined to keep the Commandments in the literal sense is most obvious. Into what vagaries and finally desolation would we not come if there were no anchorage in literal obedience! Literal obedience may be seen as the hoops of a barrel.

We are left in no doubt whatsoever as to what the Divinely intended uses of the Sabbath are. That it is for public worship is evident from the statement that the custom of the Lord was to go into the synagogue on the Sabbath day. That it is for spiritual instruction is taught by the fact of the Lord's teaching on that day, and thus for rest from labor and for meditation on matters that concern salvation and eternal life. That it is a day for the special exercise of love to the neighbor is taught by the Lord's many ministries upon that day. Things of imperative necessity can be done on the Sabbath, as is taught by the parable of taking the sheep out of the pit.

The statement that "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath," does not open the gates for a man to neglect the sanctuary, and seek the pleasures of the natural man; for the statement is immediately followed by a declaration of the general purposes of the Sabbath—'The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day"—which tells us that then the particular service of the Lord should reign.

"Compulsory service is not acceptable to the Lord," yet as the Lord saves that nation among the nations which observes His injunctions, and all holiness would pass away without public worship, a nation should wisely protect the

Sabbath just as it would protect its people from national destruction by disease.

The errors made in the past producing the impression that true worship is performed only in churches and as such is a saving power, should be corrected by the exaltation of the Scriptural Sabbath, not departing one word from what can be confirmed by the Word. In the true Sabbath of Jesus Christ one will find an inward rest powerful to restore above all other kind. The salvation of the nation depends upon it.

GEORGE HENRY DOLE.

CURRENT LITERATURE

"THE WILL TO BEAUTY."

The author of this book is one of those eccentric and irresponsible individuals whose mind works with borrowed terms and borrowed ideas but is incapable of interpreting and ordering them. He is frankly, not to say offensively, anti-religious and anti-moral in principle, if not in fact, an extraordinary product of combined egotism and naturalism. He gets the barbarous and unintelligible title of his book from Nietzsche's phrase translated Will to Power. William James's "Will to Believe" was idiomatic English, and no doubt *Will zu Macht* is good German, but Will to Power and Will to Beauty are obnoxious and abhorrent to English speech. We are constantly annoyed by the re-iterated and uninterpreted juxtaposition of the words Will to Beauty, and we find it hopeless to determine precisely what the author means by it.

It is risky throughout to attach definite meaning to any term or to any statement the author uses. He writes as an autocrat, and with a sense of superiority that does not condescend to drop to the level of the reader or allow himself to be held responsible for clear thinking and clear writing. We are constantly puzzled by the occurrence of language of deep and vast philosophical significance, inextricably entangled with the most reckless dogmatism. We should, of course, in fairness to the author, present instances and references to justify this characterization, but to do this adequately and conclusively would take us beyond the limits of a brief notice. We must therefore content ourselves with giving certain of the impressions and reflections aroused in the reading.

In spite of its chaotic structure, the book is interesting as a case of re-action upon the philosophies of Schopenhauer and

**The Will to Beauty:* Being a continuation of the philosophies of Arthur Schopenhauer and Friedrich Nietzsche. By Abraham Kanovitch. New York: Gold Rose Printing Co. 1922. 192 pp., 8 vo.

Nietzsche; and the kinship to Nietzsche is very close, both in spirit and in form. Not only is the title borrowed from Nietzsche, but the influence of Nietzsche's style and his attitude towards life, especially religious and moral life, are conspicuous. It must be said, however, that the author's attitude towards men, or mankind in general, is more humane than Nietzsche's; and this is obviously due to putting the conception of Beauty in the place of the conception of Power. We are decidedly impressed that if the author had developed his conception systematically and consistently, the result would have been different and his book would have been a notable contribution to the discussion of the metaphysics of beauty, a desideratum of primary importance. As it is, very little is done with either the fact or the conception of beauty, although much confident and dogmatic assertion is made about its supreme philosophic significance. On the other hand, all the emphasis is laid on the ultimate nature of "Will" as the primal essence of the universe; this brings us to the author's central thought and the one which he develops in a somewhat novel way.

The philosophy of the book is well summarized in the first paragraph, as follows:

> By the Will to Beauty I mean that the unconscious motive of the universe strives and remains dissatisfied until it is able to attain the realization of its energy in the climax of emotion in the human ego, *not through sorrow and religion,* which is its negative mode of attainment, but by a rationally constructed social order, where the human ego can grow in beauty, and his or her emotion rise gradually through happiness and sex passion to the ecstacy and the profound adoration of nature. This is nature's flower.

From the New-Church point of view, this is an interesting philosophical program, in spite of its unappreciative reference to religion and the suspicious exaltation of the adoration of nature.

The leading features of the treatment may be suggested by presenting some of the leading and characteristic headings, such as: The Unconscious Motive Seeks Itself in Human Emotion, The Contrast of Emotions, The Superstate Is a

Condition of Undominated Force Yielding to the Will of the Ego, "Beyond Good and Evil" (a reference to "Nietzsche the Immoralist"), Nature Changes from Contrast to Motive, from Motive to Contrast, The Mind, the Amplifier, Interpretation as a Means of Discovering the Truth as Opposed to the Scientific Method, The Social Order of the Future. The reader's expectations are duly aroused by the proposal to discuss these themes of primary philosophical interest. He is disappointed to fine that they are not so much discussed as asserted. The universe is inconsistently conceived, after the manner of Schopenhauer, as Will, also as Motive, Emotion, Passion—inconsistently so conceived because for the author as for all the naturalistically minded, the universe is at bottom Matter. Will, and its equivalents Emotion, Passion, is really the motive force which actuates Matter and directs its movements. Will, here, is the "unconscious motive" which is striving to attain satisfaction in the conscious ego. All this is, of course, logical and philosophical crudity; any striving for satisfaction in the attainment of an end in view is *ipso facto* conscious. The self-contradiction here involved is the common fate of all philosophies of the unconscious, for instance von Hartmann's. However, it is interesting to note that much of the author's language on this central theme is in remarkable agreement with that which a New Churchman would use in developing his Philosophy of Love.

The next metaphysical stage of the author's thought is his conception of Contrast. Here we have the statement "Reality is Contrast," and he pursues this theme throughout the book. The reader as usual is puzzled to know what is meant by "Contrast" in such a statement. Contrast, difference, likeness, etc., are relations, and imply terms which stand in the relations, but to speak of contrast as the reality apart from the things contrasted is another case of self-contradiction. A little close reading, however, shows that the author does not in fact take contrast as reality, but thinks of it as a character inherent in the development of the "unconscious motive of the universe"; from this point of view it is interesting to follow his development. Motive and contrast, so the argument goes,

are the primal factors of the universe; the motive develops contrasts, and contrasts are resolved in the motive. The original contrast is space and time, which arises with the existence of matter; then we have the contrast of cause and effect. Lesser contrasts arise in the development of motive, that is in the development of the universe; the last and highest of these contrasts is the sex relation, that of man and woman. We cannot stop to consider the crude metaphysics of all this, but it is worth while to develop briefly the author's views of sex and man; for it is at this point that he comes nearest to a philosophy of love. The motive of the universe culminates in the existence, or production, of men and women; in their mutual love the motive of the universe attains its highest satisfaction. The author rejects, with his characteristic inconsistency, the idea of spirit, as he does that of religion and morality, and yet he introduces the fact of spirit under a new name, the term "Superstate." Men and women survive death and continue to live in the relation of husband and wife in the superstate. In this state the Will and Emotion have free play; the environment is plastic and yields perfectly to the creative activities of the Will. The ideas here seem to be borrowed directly or indirectly from Swedenborg's doctrine of the spiritual world. The characteristic difference is that Swedenborg's doctrine of God and of spirits as recipients is totally absent. The superstate is radically individualistic, the emotions flow without restraint; the distinction between good and evil is repudiated; religion and morality have a provisional and perverted function in the actual order of society here below. This is because society here is mechanical and badly adjusted, and so restricts and restrains the individual abnormally. The normal condition of the individual is absolute self-assertion in a perfectly adapted environment. Mutual love, mutual helpfulness, and mutual self-surrender are all abhorrent to the author's view and system. It is all an instance of an ill balanced and exaggerated philosophy of aesthetics, and as such it is typical of all individualistic and naturalistic personalities with whom the restraints of religion and morality are despised, and discarded as hostile. Such

is the outcome of neglecting the distinction between the natural and the spiritual, the unregenerate and the regenerate. No man or angel is good enough to trust and to live out his unregulated and unchastened emotions; and in this fact we have the justification of morality and religion. On the other hand it is a gross misconception to consider morality and religion as merely restrictive and repressive, for they are essentially positive in setting forth and demanding the fulfilment of ends and ideals. Every pursuit of an end excludes what tends to defeat the accomplishment of the end. This is the essence of morality and religion.

LEWIS F. HITE.

A MODERNISTIC INTERPRETATION OF THE FUTURE LIFE.*

THE Ingersoll Lecture on Immortality for 1922 was delivered before a large and sympathetic audience which included many undergraduates of Harvard and Radcliffe. It was generally accepted as a brilliant interpretation of twentieth century sentiments. It was the work of a highly admired ecclesiastical scholar of great literary gifts. But alas that Christianity has fallen upon such evil days—alas for a Christianity without a Savior who "rose again from the dead"! St. Paul, we remember, based his teaching and the hope of the faithful on the resurrection of Jesus Christ:

> Now if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen: And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith also is vain. . . . If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.

Yet Rev. Professor Lake has not a word to say of the

**Immortality and the Modern Mind.* By REV. PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE, M.A., D.D. (The Ingersoll Lecture for 1922.) Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1922. 51 pp. $1.00.

resurrection of our Savior, and dismisses indeed whatever the Scriptures may have to say with sophisticated summariness. The Christian's belief in immortality is built on the miracle of Easter day which turned despairing disciples into Apostles with a message of hope to a dying world, and on the character of man as spirit, not body. Apparently modernism does not hold these beliefs.

Professor Lake indicates, in a brief historical summary, the development of the doctrine of immortality in the Christian Church, and tells us that the tenet of the resurrection of the body is Jewish in its origin, while that of the resurrection of the soul is Greek. New-Churchmen have never held the old belief in material immortality; the lecturer sketches the breakdown of this doctrine in the Anglican Church. But the survival of the individual soul is also thrown overboard. Says Mr. Lake:

> Meanwhile probably most hold individual life to cease with death. . . . Men regard the permanent survival of their individuality much as they look at schemes for their permanent rejuvenation: a pleasant dream, impossible of fulfilment.

Some attention is paid psychical research, however, and the possibility of a proof of the survival of the individual through spirit communication is asserted.

Turning away from the "pleasant dream" of personal (or, as Professor Lake would say, individual) immortality, our attention is centered in the closing pages of the book on social survival. It is George Eliot's "O may I join the choir invisible of those immortal dead who live again in minds made better by their presence" over again, the immortality of one's contribution to the work of the world, one's influence. We are told:

> There is today among the most active and virile of our contemporaries a new attitude toward life, for they have almost suddenly ceased thinking about their own Immortality and regard their work as more important than their own souls.

Mr. Lake goes on at some length in this panegyric strain, either forgetful or ignorant of the fact that one Emanuel

Swedenborg, a quaint old spirit seer of the eighteenth century, pointed out long, long before our enlightened age the fallacy of sanctified selfishness, the self-seeking piety of too many a Romish saint. But the evil of seeking one's own salvation, the truth of finding one's life by losing it, did not to Swedenborg's mind mean the denial of the survival of the individual soul. There was in his teaching none of the "vicious contrast" of personal and social immortality which Mr. Lake indulges in. Swedenborg would "transcend by including." He would admit the value of influence, work, friendship as surviving death in this world, and yet affirms an immortality not of this world. He would join Mr. Lake in his approval of our Savior's words "He that loseth his life shall find it," but he would give a fuller meaning to the word "find" than any natural minded philosopher could give.

The book closes with an attempt to distinguish between personality and individuality, his point being that while the latter is to be thought of as a dividing force, the former unites us with others, and with God. But just what Professor Lake means by "personality" is not apparent from his pantheistic reveries on the subject, nor is the mystic doctrine of "lifted barriers," to which he attaches great importance, much more comprehensible. One does not doubt that these terms have a significance in the mind of the eminent writer; but one does question whether he has succeeded in transmitting that significance to others.

EDWARD AUSTIN WARREN, JR.

"IS HELL ETERNAL?"*

PEOPLE of the sternest logic still have qualms of conscience and heart at the thought of an eternal hell. Mr. Pridgeon thinks that there is logic on their side, too, if they but knew

**Is Hell Eternal, or Will God's Plan Fail?* By the Rev. CHARLES H. PRIDGEON, A.M. New York: Funk and Wagnalls. 1920. 350 pp., 12 mo. $1.75 net.

it, and that many Scriptures at least do not proclaim an eternal hell as they have been thought to do. In its direct intent the book is a challenge to the idea of "everlasting punishment," but it extends to declaring that hell is not eternal. Hell, as a condition of unspirituality, might conceivably endure without perpetual and endless punishment for a feature, but Mr. Pridgeon does not reckon with the possibility.

The author is President and Founder of the Pittsburgh Bible Institute. The chapters of the book were done with some thought of the Institute's using them as separate leaflets. Perhaps it is because of this two-fold effort that the bearing of some chapers on the question of the book was not apparent. Of the thirty chapters some representative titles are Barriers to a Candid Consideration, What Saith the Scriptures, Eternity Is Not Time, The Ages Presented, The Millenial Age, The Great Neglected Age, The Judgments of God Illumined, Unpardonable Sins, The Eternal Humanity of Christ, Since God Is Love, The Unselfishness of God, Final Permanence of Character, The Limitations of Human Freedom, Conscience Must Be Satisfied. There is a good index.

Bible studies which issue from Bible Institutes seem always to be featured with some plan of the ages, in the scheme of which the whole discussion moves forward. After this present age will follow the millenial age, and then the age of the ages, and even Hades—whether in its good part, Paradise, or its evil, Tartarus—lies in time with eternity beyond. "Eternity in its absolute sense does not emerge until after these two ages are ended" (p. 60). Putting eternity off like this seems to make eternity itself temporal! Of punishment in eternity the Bible does not speak, but only of punishment for an "age." Furthermore, eternity is only in God, and Christ, and in those who receive Christ. The plain outcome of this view would be the annihilation of those who do not receive Christ by the end of time, except that Mr. Pridgeon is sure that God's plan, which is the salvation of all, cannot fail. He also argues that "as evil in its nature is not eternal in the past, therefore it cannot possibly be eternal in the future." We fear the same assertion could be made of finite humanity.

Indeed, until a spiritual world is posited in which one has, not eternity, but the reflection of eternity in unending progress in spiritual attainment, one cannot begin to talk of the continuance of even the good in another life. But when one can do that, one can also logically begin to talk of the persistence of evil there.

Mr. Pridgeon feels that much of the endless torture idea is paganism foisted on Christian thought; but on some other subjects he seems to us to accept pagan importations into Christian belief, as in the chapter in which he discusses the salvation of angels and demons, when the conceptions of angel and demon, superhuman creatures, were foreign ideas brought into Jewish thought first and carried along into Christian. It is possible that the ages as Mr. Pridgeon handles them are the artificial treatment of history by past ages, reflected in Scripture.

Alive to the question which the human heart has with the thought of an "eternal hell," we could wish that Mr. Pridgeon could have dealt with the subject more forcefully, especially without the unreal dissection of history into his "ages."

WM. F. WUNSCH.

SIGNS OF PROMISE.

If we could but be indifferent to the welfare of the masses! But no true Christian can be, least of all a true New-Churchman; especially in view of the fact that in our mammonistic civilization there are many factors at work tending to the further concentration of the economic wealth of the nation in the hands of an ever smaller proportion of its inhabitants, —a tendency pregnant with many extremely undesirable possibilities. It is easy to see the application of the parable of the wolf, the sheep, and the good shepherd to the civilization of today; and in this civilization every true New-Churchman must be of the good shepherd type. He must desire to protect the masses, especially those of the future (including in all probability his own direct descendants), from the iniquitous conditions seemingly ever increasing in iniquity.

Our present mammonistic civilization is based upon the selfish principles that have come down through the ages. It manifests the spirit of the Old Age to perfection. Internal discord and external warfare are inevitable accompaniments of the system in power. But fortunately it is not the only possible system. The New Age sciences of Economics, Sociology, and Psychology, have brought to light many of the causes of social diseases of all kinds; and here and there they are suggesting remedies in accord with the Spirit of the New Age. Every true New-Churchman must believe that the will of the Lord will eventually prevail in the world, and that the forces for the eventual subjugation of the "prince of this world" are already at work. The writer believes that the principle of Christian Charity is probably more widely observed today than ever before, though not always from the standpoint of religion.

One extremely important manifestation of this principle is found in a movement less than a century old that seems to be destined to play a very important part in the transformation of society from its present plutocratic form. We refer to the so-called Co-operative Movement in that aspect of it that involves all men as consumers. Two recent books on this subject are now before us: one presenting a descriptive analysis of its present position in Great Britain, and attempting a forecast of its probable future; the other giving a somewhat detailed account of the conditions in one of the small European countries as exemplifying in considerable measure a present day Co-operative Commonwealth, which has great promise of complete accomplishment in the not very distant future.

The authors of our first book, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, are well-known figures among writers on economic subjects during the last generation,—"Who's Who" gives fully a third of a page in very small type to them. In their preface to the "Consumers' Co-operative Movement"* they speak of themselves in the following way:

*_The Consumers' Co-operative Movement._ By Sidney and Beatrice Webb. London & New York: Longmans, Green & Co. 1921. 504 pp., 8 vo. $6.50 net.

We have now been for thirty years investigating and describing democratic institutions, and only in the twenty-ninth did we publish any volume dealing with national government of the Political State. We started at the opposite end, not only because the other manifestations of Democracy . . . had been relatively neglected by writers on Political Science; but also because . . . these other manifestations seemed actually of greater importance than the Political State itself. For we have always held that it is in this spontaneous undergrowth of social tissue, rather than in further hypertrophy of the national government, that will be found, for the most part, the institutions destined increasingly to supersede the Capitalist System. . . . To us the social and political significance of the Co-operative Movement [of consumers] lies in the fact that it provides a means by which, in substitution for the Capitalist System, the operations of industry may be (and are increasingly being) carried on under democratic control without the incentive of profitmaking, or the stimulus of pecuniary gain. Those who doubt or deny the possibility of there being any practicable substitute for capitalist profitmaking will find it instructive to consider to what extent, by what means, and with what results, democratic associations of consumers have achieved their success. (Preface.)

We do not need here to go into a description of what the Co-operative Movement is. We dealt with that subject in a sufficiently clear way in our article on "Consumers' Co-operation" in the NEW-CHURCH REVIEW for April, 1921. It is of interest to note, however, that the present book informs us that the movement in Great Britain now directs a capital exceeding £100,000,000; that its sales in 1920 exceeded £250,000,000; that three-sevenths of all the families in Great Britain are now enrolled as co-operators; that to this three-sevenths of the population it supplies one-half of their foodstuffs and one-tenth of their other household purchases; and finally that *the movement is growing very much faster than the population*. In short, it furnishes indubitable evidence of the ability of the organized common people to administer any business successfully; and it prognosticates the eventual universal realization of industrial democracy,—business of the people, by the people, and for the people. Meanwhile it exemplifies a new state peacefully growing up within the old state.

We will say nothing more concerning this book, except

that no student of the subject, indeed no person interested in it, can afford to overlook this volume. Though costly ($6.50 net), it is abundantly worth the price.

Turning now to our second volume,—"Denmark, a Co-operative Commonwealth,"* by Frederic C. Howe, Ph.D.,—we note that the author is an American who during the last twenty years has produced a succession of works on economic subjects. In the book before us Mr. Howe sets forth the results of his investigations into the recent social, industrial, and governmental transformation of Denmark, a transformation still in process and as yet far from complete. But how pregnant with rich possibilities for the future! Here we find how a downtrodden and disheartened people in a relatively unfertile land, finally awoke to the causes of their distress, and by co-operative endeavors of various sorts extending over a period of hardly more than forty years gradually and peaceably threw off the oppression that beset them, and progressively improved their lot until at present they are one of the wealthiest (in well-being) and happiest nations in the world, and most heartily to be congratulated on their prospects. Doubtless it will take America many years to get rid of its plutocratic incubus; but meantime those interested in how to effect fundamental reforms can learn some valuable lessons by studying the transforming factors in Danish civilization. As an introductory study in this line we can hardly imagine a volume of more valuable information in small compass than this little work by Mr. Howe. To be sure America cannot follow the example of little Denmark, because America is not now primarily an agricultural country, and conditions in many ways are too chaotic; but success in national transformation from within is so inspiring to those with similar visions, that the story cannot but be stimulating and suggestive of possibilities. Truly such studies as these give ground for the belief that the rule of Mammon is not for all time, and that in this New Age, when things move so rapidly, a better

*_Denmark, a Co-operative Commonwealth._ By Frederic C. Howe, Ph.D. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1921. 203 pp., 12 mo. $2.00.

world than now—a world free from war, from economic exploitation, from slavery in all its forms, etc., etc.,—may not be so very far away.

We must be brief in giving an idea of the contents of this book. A list of the titles of the successive chapters will perhaps serve best as an outline: Impressions, From the Ashes, A Peaceful Revolution, Co-operative Movement, Some Gains from Co-operation, Economic Foundations (Farm Ownership), A Prophet, The People's High Schools, Making Farming Alluring, Elementary Education, The Soul of the People, A Government of Farmers, Ending Landlordism, Social Legislation, Railways, Taxes, Some Lessons from Denmark. In his Preface the author says:

> Denmark seems to me to be quite the most valuable political exhibit in the modern world. It . . . is one of the few countries in the world that is using its political agencies in an intelligent, conscious way for the promotion of the economic well being, the comfort and the cultural life of the people. This is the first lesson that this little country teaches. . . .
>
> Second, Denmark shows that the state can control the distribution of wealth and increase its production as well. It can destroy monopoly and privileges of all kinds. It can put an end to poverty. It can make it possible for all people to live easily and comfortably. That in itself is of great value. . . .
>
> Denmark also demonstrates that agriculture can be made an alluring as well as a profitable profession. . . .
>
> The culture of Denmark is also unique. It is a culture not of a few people but of the whole nation. . . .
>
> Co-operation is of the very tecture of the everyday life of Denmark. Through the thousands of co-operative societies the economic life of the people moves, just as their political life moves through the political state. And the men who have been trained in the co-operative movement are the men who have risen to political power. This co-operative movement of the farmers has ended the duality that prevails in other countries. It has put an end to the artificiality of a political state governed by lawyers, landowners, or a privileged class, and an economic state separate and detached from the political state. In Denmark men work and govern as a single undertaking. The economic and political state are merged. . . .
>
> Denmark is a demonstration of the possibilities of democracy, industrial as well as political. It is a demonstration of the resourcefulness of the average man and especially of the man farthest down.

For the prosperity, the culture, the wise legislation, and the co-operative movement are the achievement of the common people.

Mr. Howe's closing words in this volume are also especially worthy of being quoted:

Denmark has abolished privilege. In so doing she has ended many of the economic injustices that are the result of privilege. With privilege abolished democracy has taken its rightful place. And democracy has ushered in a larger degree of economic justice than in any other country in the world.

One who reads these two volumes understandingly and sympathetically can hardly doubt that the Capitalist System is destined eventually to be superseded by something vastly better. At that time there will be an ultimate foundation suited to the building of a truly Christian civilization.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

"THE CHILDREN'S BIBLE."*

Many volumes of Bible selections have been published by way of interesting children in the reading of the Sacred Scriptures; and many such books are still available. The fact that the Scribner's company has just issued another publication of this kind shows that in their opinion at least there was either a gap to be filled or an opportunity to supersede what is already on the market by something better. As to the former alternative we cannot speak, except that the Preface asserts it as a fact; but we have no doubt that the average parent, having this book placed before him together with others of a similar nature, would be strongly attracted to this handsome production, and inclined to decide in its favor. The type is large, the paper excellent, the printing thoroughly well done; while the color reproductions of the paintings of W. L.

**The Children's Bible:* Selections from the Old and New Testaments, translated and arranged by HENRY A. SHERMAN AND CHARLES FOSTER KENT. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1922. 329 pp., 8 vo., with 30 full-page illus., half in color and half in duotone. $3.50.

Taylor, and the duotone illustrations from the pictures of many other artists, embellish the text most acceptably.

We are told that more than twenty-five years of observation and study lay behind the final choice of the excerpts included, the selecting and translating of which were the work of Mr. Henry A. Sherman, "head of the department of religious literature of Charles Scribner's Sons," and Mr. Charles Foster Kent, "professor of biblical literature in Yale University," in collaboration. Of course, but a small part of the entire Bible is presented, the selections having been chosen from the standpoint of the interest of the child. Those from the Old Testament (two-thirds of the volume) run in the usual sequence; the gospel story is an outline composite from the four evangelists; and the final pages consist of selections from the epistles and the Revelation. The translation has been done into simple modern English, so that it may be readily comprehended by the younger children and easily read by those who are older. It is hoped and expected that after a child has become familiar with and fond of the stories and songs of this compilation, he will finally read the Bible as a whole with real interest and appreciation.

We suspect that the principal fault that Bible lovers will find with this volume is the simple modern English in which it is cast, thus departing from the familiar terminology and rhythm of the customary texts that have done so much to stabilize the English language since the sixteenth century. Personally, however, we see no objection to this fresh translation of selected parts as an interest awakener. The young person will not be disturbed by peculiarities of language; and there is no reason why there should be any difficulty later in life when transition is made to the customary texts.

For the use of older children it might have been well if the references to the passages had been given, so as to prompt them at times to seek the full context, and thus help to familiarize them with the Bible as a whole. The inclusion of references in some unobtrusive manner would have had value in other ways also, both for the older children and for those reading to the very young.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

"THE WEDDING GARMENT."*

MANY of our readers will be glad to hear that Pendleton's "Wedding Garment," formerly published by Little, Brown & Co. of Boston, and for some time past out-of-print, has again been printed from the original plates, this time modified solely by a New-Church imprint. As it is not a new book, it would be superfluous to attempt a new review of it here. By way of commending it to such of our readers as may not have read it, we will quote a couple of New-Church estimates found in the testimonials presented at the end of the new issue:

This book from title-page to finish is excellent in conception, true in its teachings, well sustained in story and admirable in literary style. The Church is to be congratulated upon the work, and may gratefully distribute it, trusting the results to the operation of the Holy Spirit. . . . Different enough is this story from "Gates Ajar" and the "Little Pilgrim of the Unseen," and its rational and unsparing account of a soul's experiences and development are in striking contrast with their guesses and fallacies. . . . So far as we know this is the first attempt of this kind among our people which could pass either doctrinal or literary criticism; and its excellence in both is an earnest of usefulness in an important field. (Rev. L. P. Mercer in *New-Church Messenger.*)

It would be difficult to exaggerate the delight with which we have read this beautiful little book. . . . Its great merit from the literary point of view is the success with which its incidents are themselves made to convey essential truths concerning the future life. The scene of the drama is laid entirely in the World of Spirits. . . . Young Burton's trials, while obviously filled with real and most practical significance, equal in mere romantic interest the advantures imagined by a Rider Haggard. . . . We recommend our readers to procure this very beautiful volume. If their experience matches ours, they will not seldom find that their eyes will glisten and their hearts swell with reverent and humble aspirations that they, too, may be permitted to realize some of the excellencies and holy joys so exquisitely delineated. (*New-Church Magazine,* London.)

**The Wedding Garment: A tale of the Life to Come.* By LOUIS PENDLETON. New Edition. Bryn Athyn, Pa.: Academy Book Room. 1922. 246 pp., 12 mo. Price $1.25; special white binding, $1.50.

Storage

THE LIFE OF CHAUNCEY GILES

By CARRIE GILES CARTER

A vital chapter in the history of the New Church. 500 pp., 8 vo., $4

SKETCHES OF THE NEW CHURCH IN AMERICA

By EDNAH C. SILVER

Price $1 net, postage extra (send 24c, and excess will be returned)

PRAYERS

By JOHN WORCESTER

A discourse on prayer, involving an explanation of the Lord's Prayer, followed by thirty-two short prayers suitable for daily use

Price, art paper cover, 25c postpaid; Ooze leather, 50c pastpaid

(Size 3¼ × 5¼ inches; will go in an ordinary envelope)

Order the above publications from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid
LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid
UNIFORM EDITION, (paper), 16 mo., 15c per volume, postpaid
Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.
Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books at 10 cents per copy, postpaid.

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**